

The Homiletic and Pastoral Review

Vol. XXXI

APRIL, 1931

No. 7

PASTORALIA

Popular Apologetics

Contrary to the other theological disciplines, apologetics must be characterized by a certain plasticity which enables it to adapt itself to the peculiar needs of the age. It must meet error, and, since error is Protean, it must vary its tactics to suit the situation. The classical proofs, based on those signs which God Himself has made the irrefutable credentials of Christianity, will always remain the backbone of apologetics. But these proofs themselves can be formulated in different ways, and besides there are other subsidiary arguments which at certain times will move to the foreground and occupy the center of the stage, whilst at other times they will attract but scant attention. The battle front changes from generation to generation, and the apologist must at all times be familiar with the formation of the battle line and shape his strategy to meet the circumstances. The science of apologetics is practical when it fulfills these requirements, and the apologetics taught in the seminary should be of this practical type.

It is an interesting thesis of Hilaire Belloc, which he defends in his usual brilliant manner and with great wealth of argument, that the opposition against the Church continually changes. Today she is attacked for one reason, tomorrow for an entirely different one. It is this fact which makes a certain flexibility in the defense necessary. The forces that have already spent themselves may be dealt with in a summary manner, whereas the new forces that make their appearance and come to the attack with youthful vigor call for new and carefully planned methods of defense. The first thing the apologist asks himself is: "Which are the actual forms of attack that I must repel in my own day?" "Now," writes Mr. Belloc, "the historical period in which we have most practical

interest is our own. To grasp the situation of the Catholic Church today we must appreciate which of the forces opposing her are today growing feeble, which are today in full vigor, which are today appearing as new antagonists, hardly yet in their vigor but increasing."¹ When we have made this survey of the present-day situation, we can make our defense practical and effective.

Apologetics cannot rest on its laurels but must always gird itself for new battles. It is the inherent richness of Christianity that makes it possible to adduce so many arguments in its favor. Every age discovers some new striking trait that suggests its supernatural origin. Thus, Cardinal Capecelatro says: "God Almighty has so constituted the Christian life that in every age, or rather in every series of ages, it appears with a new apologia. Now, in our day, if I am not deceived, this new apologia will be the product of the Social Question, and progress in that question will most certainly be made in the name of Jesus Christ living in His Church. To the classic defenses of the past—to martyrdom, to the more perfect sanctity of the Church, to the doctrine of the Fathers, to the monastic life, to the overthrow of barbarous powers, to Christian art and literature, to the new poetry, to the harmony of science and faith, and to the new forms of charity of the last two centuries—to all these will be added this fresh apologia, a solution of the Social Question by Catholicism and by the science Catholicism inspires."² Here we have an indication of the manner in which apologetics can be adapted to the special circumstances of the age. By incorporating these new arguments in the science of apologetics and organically integrating them with the traditional proofs, the defense of Catholicism becomes stronger as time proceeds, and the evidence of its divine origin becomes overwhelming as in the course of human development it manifests its beneficent influences in every respect. Thus, Catholicism will be linked up with everything that is elevated in human thought, beautiful in art, noble in morality, and valuable in civilization. This is the line of argument pursued by the above-mentioned learned Cardinal, as he explains in the following passage:

¹ "Survivals and Arrivals" (New York City). The excellent volume contains valuable hints for the Catholic apologist.

² "Christ, the Church, and Man. An Essay on New Methods in Ecclesiastical Studies and Worship with Some Remarks on a New Apologia for Christianity in Relation to the Social Question." By His Eminence Cardinal Capecelatro, Archbishop of Capua (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

"Finally, an attentive and unprejudiced study of the human spirit will at once show that the Catholic religion takes cognizance of, and wonderfully elevates, whatever in it is great and noble; and that it suffices alone to solve, though not without mystery, all those religious problems which exercise the intelligence and torment the heart of man, while it fully corresponds to all our best desires and hopes."³

The suggested argument has a very special pertinency in our days, for mankind is in imminent danger of losing all the spiritual and moral values essential to a genuinely human life. The new paganism is robbing humanity of everything that makes life worth living. It is scattering to the four winds the most precious inheritance of the race and preparing the return of barbarism and savagery. Now, it will appear that these things by which men live are safeguarded by the Catholic Church, and by her alone can be saved from complete destruction. She will be visioned as the ark of salvation from a deluge far worse than that which brought ruin in the days of Noah. This miraculous salvation which she brings to threatened humanity will be another mark to proclaim her divine origin.⁴

Apologetics must not only be in every respect up-to-date; it must also in a real and good sense be truly popular. By popularity in this connection is meant suitability to the mind of the common people. It is not implied that the common people are of low intelligence and incapable of critical judgment, and that popular apologetics therefore may be pitched in a low intellectual key. The

³ *Op. cit.* In the same work we read: "Thanks to the all-loving providence of God which watches over the Church, the means for the defense of Christianity and the manifestations of its truths have never been as abundant as they are now." And the author might well have added that they are growing more abundant every day.

⁴ In a sense, the recrudescence of paganism in our days spells opportunity for the Church. That is Mr. Belloc's view. In the last chapter of his book under the caption, *The Opportunity*, he writes: "The New Paganism advances over the modern world like a blight over a harvest. . . . This opportunity presented to Catholicism has two aspects. The first is, that Paganism being of its nature a confessed inability to answer the Great Questions on man's nature and destiny, is of its nature an invitation to those who possess this key. . . . To the Great Questions which man must ask himself and which so insistently demand an answer (What is man? Whence comes he? Has the universe a purpose? What part does man play in that purpose? What final destinies may be his?) the Catholic Church gives not only a reply but a fully consistent solution: a sound, complete system of philosophy. Moreover, her answer is not only consistent; it is triumphant. She knows fully her own validity; she can point in actual practice to the effect of happiness produced in society by her philosophy" (*op. cit.*).

reasoning processes of the common people, though non-technical, are frequently surprisingly correct and quite capable of sifting truth from falsehood. Popular apologetics, consequently, does not mean apologetics adapted to an inferior level of mentality but an apologetics accommodated to the non-technical mind, which, for all that, may be of a high intellectual order. An apologetics of this type must be as accurate and critical as that of a rigidly scientific character, and must not be satisfied with arguments that possess merely subjective value. The faith of the multitudes must rest on secure foundation and on reasons that can be elaborated into scientific proof; otherwise it would not measure up to the exacting demands of Catholic faith. Popular apologetics, accordingly, must be sound and solid and objectively valid; it differs from scientific apologetics only in this, that it selects arguments which lend themselves to popular statement and avoids the strictly dialectical form of exposition. It is in full accord with ecclesiastical doctrine, since the Vatican Council has explicitly defined: "Non requiritur pro quolibet fidei demonstratio scientifica credibilitatis." ⁵

Now, it would be a mistake to think that popular apologetics is easy and comes readily to anyone who attempts it. On the contrary, it is always more difficult to prove a truth to the untutored than to those who are familiar with dialectical technique. Hence, popular apologetics must have its place side by side with that of rigorously scientific structure. Rarely will the priest be called on to give a strictly logical demonstration of faith, but quite frequently he will be required to offer a popular demonstration. Dialectically trained minds are few, but ordinarily intelligent minds are numerous. And with these latter are our dealings, and to meet their peculiar requirements we must be prepared. We address our arguments mostly to the average man, or what is sometimes called the man in the street, and with him the ponderous Scholastic apparatus of the classroom avails very little. ⁶

⁵ Cfr. Denzinger (27th ed.), n. 1815. To which we may add what Joannes a S. Thoma says: "Non necesse est ad credendum fide infusa deducere in particulari per consequentiam rationes et motiva credibilitatis evidentis, id enim pertinet ad sapientes et theologos; sed tamen requiritur aliquod saltem motivum credibilitatis attingere, quantum requiritur ad prudenter credendum; qui enim sine aliquo motivo credibilitatis credit, leviter et imprudenter credit" (*De Fide*, disp. II, a. III, n. 5).

⁶ Of this popular type of apologetics Msgr. Robert Hugh Benson speaks in the Preface to his meaty little volume, "The Religion of the Plain Man" (Lon-

NEWMAN'S APOLOGETICS

What strongly affects the average man and produces conviction in his mind is not a single argument subtly developed along strictly dialectical lines but rather an accumulation of arguments. Unable to gauge accurately the logical and inherent cogency of a single proof, he remains unaffected by its logical force, however conclusive it may be in itself. To appreciate at its proper value the decisive evidence of a single argument calls for the finer perceptions of the trained logician who is in possession of the intellectual instruments and tests by which the strength of evidence can be measured almost with scientific precision. But what appeals to the lay mind is the cumulative force of many arguments that all point in the same direction and converge towards one point. Such cumulative force can be fully realized without special mental acumen and logical finesse. On this observation Newman builds his apologetics, and thus his type of argumentation is happily adapted to popular apologetics.

Father Sylvester P. Juegens, S.M., S.T.D., gives a succinct description of Newman's apologetical method in the following paragraph: "The chief external evidences which Newman finds in favor of the divinity of Christianity are not miracles, strictly so-called, but a cumulation of converging probabilities which by informal inference lead to certitude. Newman's meaning of a probability must be taken as he defines it, namely, that which we call moral certitude. These probabilities are for the most part what are called coincidences, not strictly miraculous in themselves, but which irresistibly force upon us, almost by a law of our nature, recognition of the agency of God. . . . A varying number of such coincidences are sufficient for the illative senses of different individuals to produce moral certitude, just as circumstantial evidence in a court can

don): "The book is intended for the man in the street, who, after all, has a certain claim on our consideration since Jesus Christ came to save his soul. This man in the street, like myself, is entirely unable to discourse profoundly upon the Fathers, or to decide where scholars disagree in matters of simple scholarship. His religion is composed partly of emotion, a good deal of Scripture, partly of imagination, and to a very small extent of reason. . . . Now this kind of intellectual attainment seems a poor equipment for the pursuit of salvation; but it is undoubtedly the only equipment that many of us have, and it is God that has made us and not we ourselves. Therefore, if we believe in God at all—at least in a God of mercy or even justice—we are bound to acknowledge that this equipment is all that we actually require." That is the mentality with which we have to deal, and to it our apologetics must be adapted. The approach to this type of mind is not by way of formal logic and subtle dialectics.

convince a jury of a man's guilt or innocence. Newman devotes the last pages of *The Grammar* to showing by way of illustration what kind of coincidences in the history of Christianity appeal most to him, and succeed in creating within him the certitude of its divinity. The marvelous history of the Hebrew nation, the Mosaic Religion, the Messianic Prophecies and their fulfilment in Christianity, the force that the early Christians and above all the martyrs drew from their real, living Image of Christ, all converge and combine to make him conclude: 'I feel myself justified in saying, either Christianity is from God or a revelation has never been given to us.'"⁷

The study of Newman is an excellent antidote against any view that would overestimate the value of formal apologetics. In the preaching of the Apostles the apologetical feature is not very conspicuous. They do not rest their cause on argument or evidence, but are content to set forth their doctrine on its own merits. Yet, they carried conviction to the hearts of their hearers. Two little verses admirably express their manner of procedure:

Thus the Apostles tamed the pagan breast,
They argued not, but preached; and conscience did the rest.

THE APOLOGETICS OF GOOD EXAMPLE

Nothing contributed more to the conversion of the pagan world than the outstanding virtues of the early Christians. The Fathers not rarely adduced these virtues as arguments in favor of the divine power inherent in the Christian religion. The unsullied life of the Christians in an environment of unspeakable moral corruption struck the pagans as nothing short of the miraculous. And, indeed, it was a miracle of a peculiar kind, a miracle of the moral order. It was, moreover, a miracle of an especially engaging and attractive nature which at the same time could be thoroughly appreciated by everybody. How often did it happen in those days of pristine fervor that the virtue of a slave, proof against temptation of every kind, brought into the fold the master and his entire house! Good example is a triumphant force. It is worth more than argument. It possesses a divine and convincing logic of its own. The victories of early Christianity must in a very large measure be credited to

⁷ "Newman on the Psychology of Faith in the Individual" (New York City).

the purity, the charity, the integrity, the heroic self-abnegation of the first disciples of the Apostles. Evidence of another kind was hardly necessary and of wholly secondary importance. This was quite natural, for sanctity is one of the marks by which the true Church may be recognized. If this mark shines forth with special splendor, it becomes by itself a proof of irresistible force.

The apologetics of good example has lost none of its force in our own days. The tree is still judged by the fruits which it bears, and creeds are judged by the lives of those who profess them. In fact, it is a criterion that will strongly appeal to a pragmatic age. If truth is that which works, then the true religion must of necessity outclass all others by the effects it produces in the conduct of its adherents. The saint at all times is an unanswerable argument for the divine origin of the Church. If we had more saints to demonstrate the supernatural power inherent in the Church, the apologists would have very little to do.⁸

The power of good example in bringing men into the Church is undisputed. Thus, Father Joseph McSorley, C.S.P., writes: "Concerning good example, we need only remind ourselves that its importance in the apostolate can hardly be exaggerated. Here again the Holy Father's recent appeal indicates what is really our greatest need after prayer. Who can estimate the result that would come from our exemplifying on a large scale the sublime Catholic ideals of individual, domestic and social virtue? Hardly anything, except the all-powerful grace of God, could be a more efficacious

■ The following illustrates the effect produced by the phenomenon of sanctity: "I shall not apologize for the fact that my conversion to Roman Catholicism began with an attraction, with an appeal, which was addressed primarily to my religious emotions rather than my religious convictions. I had been an Anglo-Catholic for eleven years, for six of which I was very well satisfied with my religion. Then in the summer of 1925 an Anglican friend who was present at the canonization rites of St. Thérèse of Lisieux brought me back a medal and a secondary relic, and from that day the course of my religious life was troubled. It is difficult to describe the impression this young Saint made upon me. It was not only the beauty of her life, the charm, wit and sweetness of her recorded words, or the lovely simplicities of her Little Way. It was rather the realization of that sanctity, that heroic virtue, that sublime love, being offered to the modern world. Here was a Saint who, if she had been alive today, would scarcely have been old—a Saint of our times whose features and expression have been given us not only by the painter and ecclesiastical image-maker but by the photographer. In Lisieux are still living men and women who knew her and spoke to her, including her own sisters; her canonization miracles were not found in documents or in tradition, but on the lips of living witnesses. And when I looked at her, I saw not merely herself, but the living, unfailing fountain of sanctity which is the Church that made her what she was" (Sheila Kaye-Smith, "Dropping the Hyphen," in *The Dublin Review*, January, 1930).

instrument."⁹ In another place the distinguished author enlarges on this subject. We cannot refrain from quoting him at some length: "In addition to the apostolate of the press and the apostolate of the pulpit, and far more necessary than even the coördinating of our activities, is the contribution of good example. We may with wisdom and industry conceive and carry out every sort of plan to interest the multitude, to answer objections, to make clear the exact teachings of the Church, but we cannot reasonably hope for large success if we are indifferent to the influence of good conduct. It ranks next after prayer. The need for both is plain. The Christian tradition going back to our Lord Himself teaches us to begin nothing without recourse to prayer. . . . Hardly less obvious is our duty to demonstrate Catholic truth by the argument of good example. . . . The conduct of the individual Catholic weighs heavily among the arguments for or against the truth of Catholicism. . . . In planning for the propagation of the faith, then, we must allow full value to the influence of Catholic conduct upon the minds of our fellow-countrymen."¹⁰ Americans are a practical people and not overmuch impressed by mere theorizing and airy speculation. More than others they are inclined to judge the Church by what it accomplishes in the way of moral improvement. This constitutes for American Catholics a challenge and an opportunity. Good example is a form of apologetics not restricted to the scholarly, but well within reach of all the faithful. CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

⁹ "The Priest and Popular Apologetics," *The Ecclesiastic Review* (May, 1929).

¹⁰ "The Argument of Good Example," in *The Missionary* (June, 1929). In this connection we may appropriately mention the apologetical value of Catholic scholarship in purely scientific fields. A Catholic, whose name is identified with notable achievements in scientific research and who sincerely professes and practises his faith, renders perhaps a greater service to the cause of truth than volumes of apologetical literature. His example will often more readily overcome doubt than a theoretical refutation. Such scholarship combined with practical Catholicism is the need of the hour in America. The Rev. John M. Cooper, D.D., stresses this need when he writes: "Catholic standing in the field of science today depends, not on what Catholic scientists have done in the past, but on what they are doing in the present and are prepared to do in the immediate future. It depends not on absorptive scholarship, that is, on the number of Catholic men and women who are masters of their own technical field. It depends upon productive scholarship, upon the Catholic men and women who through original investigation and research are making or will make new contributions to the sum total of human knowledge. In no other way can Catholic status in science be achieved or maintained. And such status must be achieved and maintained, if the Catholic cause is to be presented sympathetically to the intellectual leadership of our modern world. . . . The Catholics of Europe have made and are making magnificent contributions to scientific research. In this country we as Catholics are only beginning to do so on any appreciable scale" ("Religion Outlines for Colleges." Course III, Washington, D. C.).

NEW HAVEN: THEN AND NOW

By THE RIGHT REV. MSGR. H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

"When I was a boy in New Haven, there were only three Catholic churches in town; now there are thirty."—WILLIAM LYON PHELPS.

The words of the distinguished litterateur and clergyman which I have used as a sort of text for this paper are taken from one of his series of "As I Like It" articles in *Scribner's Magazine* (August, 1930). He there devotes much space to answering the question: "Why do so many Catholics go to church, and why do so many Protestants stay away?" He was born in New Haven. His many years of professorship at Yale added to his knowledge of religious conditions in his native city. His broad sympathies and kindly culture enabled him to write in genial and appreciative fashion about Catholics.

He was a boy of ten years when the Rev. Dr. John Hall delivered the Lyman Beecher Lectures before the Theological Department of Yale College for the year 1875. This fact "intrigues" me from a homiletic standpoint. If there were only three Catholic churches in New Haven when Dr. Phelps was a boy and there are now thirty, it is quite possible that the Lectures of Dr. Hall contain a moral for us. For Dr. Hall paid frequent attention to the Catholic Church in his lectures, sometimes in the text and sometimes in the footnotes. And his attention was not at all a flattering one. Whether the footnotes were added after his lectures had been delivered, I do not know; but the text would alone manifest his attitude sufficiently. His volume was published in the same year under the title, "God's Word Through Preaching" (Dodd, Mead and Co., New York City). The contrasting views of Dr. Hall and Dr. Phelps really invite us to look upon the "Then" and on the "Now."

I

Dr. Hall reviewed only incidentally, and therefore most summarily, the history of preaching. Having mentioned St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom, he forthwith glances at the Middle Ages: "The era of the Middle Ages is, as far as preaching is concerned, a wilderness resounding with the cries of sacerdotal parrots, and relieved only by the monkey-tricks of fanatical friars."

What did he mean by the Middle Ages? He evidently contemplated a very long stretch of time, since, having mentioned St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom, he uttered the words I have quoted, and immediately adds: "No language compatible with conventional propriety could describe the degradation of that time. No wonder that Luther, who broke through and broke up this state of things, is sometimes harsh and coarse. The wonder is, that he was so measured." From St. Augustine to Luther is a long leap achieved in a marvellously short time.

There are several eras within that long stretch. From the death of St. Augustine (430) to what are styled the Dark Ages is one era, worthy of some attention. Next comes the era of the Dark Ages, concerning which the Rev. S. R. Maitland, F.R.S., F.S.A., wrote his masterpiece of iconoclastic criticism of some more or less notable names in historiography. Maitland treated roughly of the ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, and incidentally gives us some specimens of the preaching of those times. Of course, Dr. Hall could never have read that classic work, although its various editions assuredly made it very possible for him to consult the work. He speaks of "sacerdotal parrots." Commenting on Maitland's volume, Frederick Stokes, M.A., wrote: "One of the points upon which there is a strong contrast between our own times and the Dark Ages is the greater degree of *individualism* in the latter. We live in an age of machinery. Government is carried on by Parliaments, ballots, caucuses—all machinery. In the Dark Ages it was not so. It was a time when men were governed by men." I have italicized the word *individualism* of Stokes by way of contrast with the *parrots* of Hall.

Then comes the Thirteenth Century. Dr. Hall was a Presbyterian minister. He was born in Ireland, and presumably represented North of Ireland Presbyterianism. So was, however, the Rev. Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson, who contributed some chapters to the work on Latin Hymns by the Rev. Dr. Duffield, and who is nevertheless amazed in contemplation of this Thirteenth Century. Writing on the *Dies Iræ*, Dr. Thompson says: "All Christendom rejoices in it as a common treasure, the gift of God through a devout Italian monk of the thirteenth century. It was in an age full of vitality that this 'hymn of the giants' was written—the most interesting

century in the history of Christendom, Matthew Arnold says. In all directions we encounter the play or collision of great forces. . . . Popes like Innocent III and Gregory IX, founders of religious orders like Dominic and Francis, theologians like Aquinas and Bonaventura, may excite our admiration or our censure, but they are men of such magnitude as are not to be found in other centuries in the same number. They were live men, and they have made a lasting impression upon the world by the force of their vitality." Read Dr. Hall's summary view once more, and marvel, if you will, at the "monkey-tricks of fanatical friars."

Had Dr. Hall no good word to say of St. Gregory the Great in the first era, or of St. Bernard in the second era, or of such men as Dr. Thompson mentions in the third era—or of the apostles who, within those eras, converted barbarous Europe (including Ireland, by the way) to Christianity? Were all such men "sacerdotal parrots"? Did other such men indulge in "the monkey-tricks of fanatical friars"?

Had Dr. Hall never come upon the Rev. Dr. Neale's "Mediæval Preachers and Mediæval Preaching"? The long Introduction of that work compares—say rather, contrasts—medieval preaching with modern preaching, and the sixty-five pages of the Introduction ought to give us moderns "furiously to think." For they are a very flat contradiction to Dr. Hall's summary. Now, Neale's volume was published long before Hall lectured at Yale on preaching.

I think it not improbable that Baring-Gould's "Post-Mediæval Preachers" came under some slight view of Dr. Hall, because of the "jocular preachers" of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries occasionally figuring therein; but the title of the volume should have been a warning to Dr. Hall, whose view of the epochs in history is startling. However, the sixty pages of the Introduction, with the tributes paid here and there to earnest, able and devout preachers of that era, should have warned him to speak with some little care before the students of a celebrated seat of learning like Yale. Really, he paid a poor compliment to the knowledge and intelligence—not to add, the sense of common decency—of his studious auditory. He speaks to that auditory of "fanatical friars," and is himself a truly wonderful example of North of Ireland Presbyterianism.

I have referred to his auditory. It comprised not only students of divinity, but as well (as the testimonial letter of the Faculty to Dr. Hall, after the lectures had been delivered, remarks) "not a few others—most of them working ministers of the Gospel," and presumably the Faculty itself, composed of such names as: Leonard Bacon (author of many theological works), George E. Day, Samuel Harris, James M. Hoppin (author of a large work on Homiletics), George P. Fisher (author of a standard text on General History), and Timothy Dwight. These are important names of scholarly men. Of course, testimonial letters may be like after-dinner eulogies of a prominent guest; but one may still be surprised that such professors could declare *in scriptis* that they are happy to learn that the Lectures were soon to be published. But perhaps the most significant portion of the testimonial letter (in so far as my present purpose is concerned) refers to the theological students: "We are sure that these young men, dispersed as they soon will be over the breadth of the continent, and some of them into other lands, will be better ministers, both in the pulpit and out of it, for what they have learned from you—better in the highest sense, for what we have valued most of all in these lectures is the deep and healthy religious impression which they have left upon the hearers."

One is permitted to wonder whether the young men thus bettered by the lectures may not have carried "over the breadth of the continent" the seeds of ignorant and fanatical denunciation so industriously sown by Dr. Hall, which they in turn would scatter up and down the land of America. Catholics can understand in some fashion the sad condition of things among the "hill-billies" in respect of even rudimentary education in our own day. But Yale? Can the shameful decennial attacks on Catholicity which reached such unintelligible depths of calumny during the months preceding the last Presidential election have owed some of their ignorance and their virulence to Dr. Hall?

The little bit I have quoted from Dr. Hall's Lectures is not an exceptional sample of his manners and his knowledge. I read (page 15, footnote): "One need not wonder that the same perverted ingenuity that made necromancers, conjurors, and every variety of oracle in heathendom, and found for them some plausible foundation in the facts of human nature, should have turned the sacraments

into the coarsest kind of fetish, as has been done in Roman Catholic countries." Again I read (page 24, footnote) these words: "Romanism in its various forms is a skillful travesty of the truth." I read in the text, however, this warning (pages 94, 95):

"There is some need, also, for more attention to the Romish controversy than has hitherto been given. It includes the question of questions in Europe at this moment. But it is only a small and relatively unimportant part of the argument that is now enlisting alike divines and statesmen. Long before this inquiry into the contradictory obligations of Roman Catholics in Protestant countries arose, there has been, and long after it has lost its interest there will be, the deeper, wider, and farther-reaching question of salvation by grace, or salvation by something else. Americans have been indifferent to these issues from strong confidence in their institutions, and from a certain contempt for Romanism, natural enough in the circumstances. This continent has not yet had a strong and capable expositor of Romish views. The system has been poorly represented, timid, and rather asking toleration than influence. It is capable of adapting itself to all governments and all conditions of society. It can use the resources of the poor; it can, like the priests of Baal in Ahab's time, feed at the table of the State. That we need not pay much attention to it because it will never dominate this Republic, is an egregious mistake."

There is more to the same general intent, but this much will suffice. The trumpet gives forth no uncertain sound. The young divinity students are implored to prepare for the issue—the issue raised by Mr. Marshall and dissected by Alfred Smith. A footnote on page 96 adds: "It is not only in the action of Romanism on the public schools that there is cause for anxiety. In many parts of the country, under most mistaken ideas, Protestant parents intrust their children, particularly daughters, to Roman Catholic educators. The education is second-rate, but it is showy; and the influence is almost uniformly un-Protestant."

Again I read in the text (pages 106-107):

"The priestly theory, for example, marks the Roman, the Greek, and most heathen systems. It shapes the labors of the clergy in almost every particular. They can only 'officiate' with the prescribed robes; they can only move on the line of rubrics; they succeed in the degree in which they are accepted as official representatives. To get a bit of brass in the form of a cross hung round

the neck next the skin, and out of all men's sight; to 'christen' a baby even without the knowledge or approval of parents; to anoint a man even though he is incapable of responding to any movement secular or spiritual; to give 'Christian burial'—whatever that exactly means—to the dead, who in life would have given nothing good to the celebrant—these are admissible in such clerical life."

There are three pages of this intrusive matter, which whoso will may look up for himself. I read in a footnote (page 210) : "Luke, xvi. 9. In natural recoil from 'indulgences' and salvation by money, Protestants have been shy of this text." I read in the text (page 191) : "With the growth of superstition . . . we get to the elaborate trifling of the Schoolmen. . . . The Reformation broke up these cardboard castles . . . and sent men after the fashion of Augustine to the Scriptures. . . . What facts are in nature . . . Bible texts are to the theologian. These we sift, examine, analyze, classify." The context is too long for full quotation, but the amusing thing about it is that, having derided the Schoolmen in respect of the Bible, Dr. Hall misquotes, in this connection, the Bible in one of its best-known texts. "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name be the glory," he triumphantly concludes. But the text in his Bible is "*give* glory," and not "*be* the glory." Did he "sift, examine, analyze, classify"? He both misquoted the text and misinterpreted it, for it is not an ascription of glory to the Lord and away from ourselves, but a great cry for help.

II

Dr. Phelps was a boy of ten years when Dr. Hall lectured at Yale to an audience comprising the divinity students, working ministers and members of the faculty. Time works marvellous changes. The same boy, now a highly esteemed member of the University's faculty, draws briefly but skilfully the picture of Catholicity in New Haven at the present time. He takes up the question of why so many Catholics go to church today, and why so many Protestants stay away from church. "All the talk today about neglect of church-going and so on," he writes, "applies only to us Protestants. The Catholics need no sympathy because they have no problem. Not only are the Catholic churches crowded—I have never attended one that was not—but they are steadily increasing

in number. When I was a boy in New Haven, there were only three Catholic churches in town; now there are thirty. But an even more astounding fact, a fact that seems to me to have an enormous significance, is the Catholic rise in social prestige. When I was a child, I was ignorant of European conditions, and of the real nature of Catholic Christian worship. I honestly believed there were no intelligent Catholics; I thought all Catholics were ignorant, that they all belonged to the class of unskilled laborers. I was not acquainted with a single Catholic family of social consequence. Today the situation is totally different. At Yale there are more Catholic undergraduates than there are Baptists; one meets intelligent Catholics everywhere; and in England such distinguished men of letters as G. K. Chesterton, Maurice Baring, Compton Mackenzie, Alfred Noyes, Sheila Kaye-Smith, all brought up otherwise, have joined the Catholic Church. The last thing I wish to suggest is social snobbery; I do not care a rap for any one's social position, unless there are brains and character behind it. What I wish to emphasize as a fact of deepest significance is the enormous elevation in social and intellectual distinction which I have seen in the Catholic Church. . . . But the Catholic Church has made no deductions from its faith; it has made no compromises; it does not take any converts on *their* terms. It takes them all, poor and rich, cultivated and ignorant, on *its* terms. The chief reason, I think, why so many persons are added to the Catholic Church is not because of the ritual, beautiful and impressive as that is; it is because the Catholics put religion first. It is refreshing to enter a Catholic Church and breathe an atmosphere of faith."

Many converts have told the story of their conversion, some briefly and some at great length. Dr. Phelps has fancied one great reason, but the ordinary story of conversion is of growing doubt removed finally by prayer and human study of the Catholic Church. Reason triumphs rather than simply a pious admiration for any one who puts religion first. But this is quite aside from the testimony given by Dr. Phelps to the fact of Catholic growth in New Haven. That growth is symbolic of the progress of Catholicity throughout the land.

In spending some time on Dr. Hall's Yale Lectures on Preaching I do not think that I have been merely fighting shadows. The per-

sistence of error, of misrepresentation, of calumny, is of course amazing. In respect of medieval preaching, for instance, the works of Maitland, Neale, and even Baring-Gould appear to be little known. The classic of Maitland seems, from some experience I have had of professors of history, to be an unknown quantity in spite of the fact that, in virtue of its very title, it lies in their pathway so obtrusively that they must at least have stumbled upon it.

While we recognize this persistence of error and may be tempted to occasional disheartenment at our slow progress in dissipating the clouds of misunderstanding and of calumny that have so long been lowering over us, we have the comfort of the prophecy of Isaias: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper: and every tongue that resisteth thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn. This is the inheritance of the servants of the Lord, and their justice is with Me, saith the Lord" (Is., liv. 17). We have also the comfort of such a picture as that drawn by Professor Phelps. The year 1875 is the "Then" of my title, and the year 1930 is the "Now." Dr. Hall assailed us then most vehemently and in varied ways. Dr. Phelps defends us now most gallantly and with many varied arguments of facts.

My main use of the contrasting facts as illustrated in the present paper is not, however, so much to give us comfort as to furnish us with a fair basis for consideration of a subsequent paper which will be entitled: "Argue not, but Preach."

THE ETHICS OF BIRTH CONTROL

By DOMINIC PRUEMMER, O.P., S.T.D.

II. The Effects of Neo-Malthusianism

The moral depravity of Neo-Malthusianism is revealed, not only by its opposition to the natural law, but also in its evil consequences. The tree is known by its fruits. For brevity's sake I shall consider only its evil effect (a) on the moral life, (b) on the common good of society, and (c) on the personal welfare of the married couple.

Effect on the Moral Life.—Neo-Malthusianism leads necessarily to moral and religious degeneracy. Married couples who make a constant abuse of marriage degenerate, as experience shows, into lukewarm and bad Christians. At first they confess their sin of marital onanism to the confessor. The latter is strictly obliged to demand amendment of life, and when this does not take place, he must refuse absolution to the relapsing sinner. One of two things then happens: either the guilty person remains away from the Sacraments thereafter (because he knows he will not receive absolution unless he refrains from his sin), or he continues to approach the Sacraments, but sacrilegiously, since he simply conceals the sins of onanism which he has committed. How many sacrilegious and how many omitted confessions must be charged to Neo-Malthusianism, God alone knows. That the number is enormous, every pastor can testify. It is also certain that an abatement of religious zeal is appearing almost everywhere, and this is due in no slight degree to Neo-Malthusianism.

But not merely the religious life but morality itself is being undermined. Neo-Malthusianism is nothing else than mutual masturbation or unnatural lust. Its practice, however, cannot permanently satisfy the sexual appetite, and the consequence is adultery after adultery. Thus develop the so-called "triangular" relations. And just as one hears marital onanism frequently discussed and commended today, so also do we find extramarital relations defended, although the last foundation of morality is thereby sapped.

Nor is this all. The unnatural fear of conception leads to the hatred of the child. Neo-Malthusianism practised by *coitus inter-*

ruptus or *præventivus* offers no absolute guarantee against conception, which thus sometimes takes place involuntarily. Now the guilty couple degenerate into murderers, destroying the unborn child by abortion. While it is impossible to supply statistics for the number of abortions (for these murders are always perpetrated in secret), it is certain that the figure must reach thousands annually. In Geneva one whole street is occupied almost exclusively by midwives who offer "discreet aid"—in other words, they are "angel-makers." An abortion of this kind, however, means not only the certain death of the child, but also frequently entails grievous danger for the mother, and not a few mothers have expiated this violent interference with their organism by long infirmity and even by death. That artificial abortion is commonly far more dangerous for the mother than a natural birth, every physician can attest.

Such, then, is the moral devastation brought about by Neo-Malthusianism. One other point must be mentioned. The one- and two-children system is the deadly foe of good education. It has been rightly said that it is easier to raise six children well than to raise one. When there are only one or two children in a family, the training is all too easily impaired by blind partiality, which produces merely a spoiled, pleasure-loving and easily corruptible child.

(b) *Effect on the Common Good.*—Neo-Malthusianism also exerts a pernicious influence on the common good and produces economic decay. Some might think that the limitation of children would produce an improvement in the economic situation, since the education of many children entails heavy expense and brings no material returns. However, this opinion is entirely erroneous and in contradiction of the facts. It can be declared with absolute certainty that with the decline or stagnation of the population the economic condition of a country will deteriorate to an extraordinary degree, and that consequently a disproportion will soon ensue between the number of workers and the opportunities for employment. As a result, despite the decline in the number of workers, wages will decrease instead of increasing. The whole economic structure of today rests entirely on the assumption of a yearly increase of births. A population that remains stationary needs no new dwellings. What

consequences this will have on the immense sums invested in the building trades may be easily imagined. The same remarks must be applied to the producers of clothing material and clothes, of heating and lighting materials and equipment, of articles of food—in short, of all the necessities of life.

The unparalleled economic development of the United States would be unthinkable but for the rapid increase of population during the last decades. Think of the gigantic industrial undertakings during this era—the building program executed, the crops produced, the merchandise manufactured, consumed or exported! All was activity, growth and progress. The hands of the native workers could not cope with the task, and hundreds of thousands of foreign laborers settled in the land and found employment and sustenance. Before the War Germany, overpopulated Belgium and even Italy offered a similar picture. On the other hand, France—where births were so strictly limited and where (*e.g.*, in Normandy and Berry) there are so many deserted towns and abandoned farms—presented, as she still presents, an exceedingly gloomy picture. Economic progress is reserved, not for a luxurious, but for a laboring people, and creative activity is never so conspicuous as in the large family.

(c) *Effect on the Personal Welfare of the Married Couple.*—That Neo-Malthusianism also impairs the personal welfare of the couple might indeed be asserted *a priori*, since it violates the natural law, and every violation of the natural law must be expiated by the person guilty of the violation. For the sake of brevity, I shall confine myself to the hygienic consequences which the abuse of marriage has on the organism of the wife. As a result of constant abuse in the sexual sphere, the female constitution must become permanently impaired. There is a well-known saying of a famous gynecologist: "Women suffer less illness from the children whom they bear than from those whom they have not borne." From the purely physiological standpoint, this is easy to explain. In the *coitus interruptus* and *præventivus* the sexual organism of the woman hardly ever reaches its natural culmination. Consequently, inflammations of all kinds occur, and the nervous system especially is prejudicially affected. Specialists in nervous ailments find that very many neuropathic abnormalities are traceable to sexual causes. This does not indeed mean that "Freudianism"—which refers all

abnormalities in the neuropathic and psychiatric domain to repressed sexual impulses—is to be recommended in all such cases.

However harmless artificial sterilization also may appear at first glance, it brings serious and lasting evil effects in its train. When a woman is artificially sterilized, a premature climacterium sets in with many highly undesirable consequences. When a man is sterilized, a gradual atrophy of the sexual organs ensues, not infrequently accompanied by various other maladies. Usually indeed artificial sterilization is resorted to only in the case of the so-called “*materia vilis*” (that is, defective individuals). The State official or the physician says to himself: “If this individual should thereby come to grief, there is one less burden for human society.” But from the purely medical standpoint every resort to artificial sterilization seems to be contra-indicated, unless an actual malady of the body is thereby relieved. This same conclusion is naturally all the more urgently required by ethico-religious and social considerations.

The results of the foregoing inquiries may be summed up in the following sentences:

(1) Incontrovertible statistics indicate an alarming growth of Neo-Malthusianism in almost every land;

(2) Neo-Malthusianism is directly opposed to the law of nature, and therefore can never be tolerated morally;

(3) Neo-Malthusianism exerts the most prejudicial influence on morality and religion, on the common good, and on the personal welfare of the married couple.

III. REMEDIES AGAINST THE EVIL OF NEO-MALTHUSIANISM

Neo-Malthusianism is a devastating plague which threatens death and ruin for all modern society. This assertion must not be regarded as a rhetorical exaggeration, for unfortunately it is the bald truth. As already clearly shown, Neo-Malthusianism is nothing but unchaste lust exercised by man and woman, and is thus a perversion of sex. But when such sexual perversity is practised by many, it gradually develops into a universal social evil which spreads like a raging conflagration. Unnatural crimes are committed; a mere mention of homosexuality, Sadism and Masochism will suffice. To what an extent these evils have engulfed men in their filthy flood,

is known only to those whose profession brings them into contact with their effects.

Within the last decade homosexuality has found a frightful propagation. In Moral Theology this vice is known as sodomy, and is one of the four sins that call to heaven for vengeance because of its horrible violation of the social order. In the large European cities it is practised at least as widely today as in ancient Sodom and Gomorrha, in ancient Athens and Rome. And all these sodomistic crimes of modern times are crying to heaven for vengeance, and this vengeance is as sure to descend as it formerly fell on Sodom, Gomorrha, Athens and Rome. Shall we remain asleep and inactive until the fiery rain smites us which once smote Sodom and Gomorrha? We must not rest content with denouncing sodomy as a much more serious sin than even Neo-Malthusianism—a sin moreover that is already punished by the civil law. Both these statements are true, but it is also true that civil justice has not yet succeeded in checking the spread of sodomy. Likewise true is it that Neo-Malthusianism, itself a perversity, prepares the way for the ultimate perversity of sodomy.

Hence the imperative demand that every right-thinking man must fight with effective weapons against the actually terrifying peril of Neo-Malthusianism. We cannot dismiss the matter with a wave of the hand, asserting that Neo-Malthusianism is merely a passing disease that will disappear of itself, and that meanwhile there are more than enough people in the world. Such frivolous speech must not be tolerated. What would we think of a man who during the progress of a pestilence should say: "This is only a passing plague which will soon pass away. What matter if a large number of people are stricken to death? Plenty of others will survive." One might perhaps be tempted to wish that the plague would grip this frivolous babbler by the throat so that he might regretfully experience in his own body the terror of the plague. Consequently, in our fight against the pest of Neo-Malthusianism we must contend with all our energy if we are to restore the purity of family life and the love of children among our people. What, then, are the best means to employ against the raging pest?

(1) First of all, social-economic conditions must be improved as much as possible, especially housing conditions in the cities. It is

only with great difficulty that a large family of the middle class, or even of the laboring class, can find a home that will satisfy even the most necessary requirements. However, the improvement of the social-economic conditions alone will not be sufficient to put an end to birth control. As already stated, birth control prevails to a great extent also among the well-to-do families, who are by no means affected by the social or housing difficulties.

(2) Religious and moral forces must be awakened and strengthened. This is the most effective remedy against birth restriction. If, indeed, the people are to be restrained from the desecration of marriage by Neo-Malthusianism, they must first be thoroughly convinced of its sacredness. Following in the footsteps of Luther, the mass of the people today regard marriage as merely a civil affair from which as much advantage as possible should be drawn with as little trouble as possible. Why do many of our young women marry today? Simply to have their needs provided for and to escape being an old maid. And why do many of our young men marry? To make a good match, and not rarely from purely sensual motives. Later desecration or abuse will inevitably result in the case of marriages entered into from such motives. Consequently, it is the serious duty of pastors, Catholic publicists, young women's and young men's societies, fathers' and mothers' associations, in fact of all who have the welfare of society at heart, to emphasize the sublime dignity of marriage. A campaign of noble enlightenment of this kind has not so far been undertaken, and consequently marriage has come to be regarded as an undignified, sensual affair. It cannot be too often or too urgently impressed on young people of marriageable age that the essence of marriage consists, not in the sexual union, but in the union of hearts and community of souls. Sensuality alone cannot satisfy any man, because there is lacking that higher element—the spiritual factor—which man desires and, of his very nature, must seek. No person gifted with esthetical feeling will imagine for a moment that enduring happiness can be expected from mere sensuality. For man is no mere beast, but a rational being whose true happiness consists, not in sensual transports, but in nobility of soul.

Furthermore, it must be impressed again and again on both the married and persons of marriageable age that matrimony is a God-

willed state with serious obligations. Whosoever enters a certain state must undertake the duties of that state, or else he is an unprincipled person who will bring unhappiness on himself and others. The young man who freely accepts the clerical state knows that he has grave duties to fulfill: if he discharges these duties nobly, he will be a source of great happiness for himself and others, but if he acts otherwise, he prepares disaster for himself and for others. The student who devotes himself to medicine knows that he has chosen a difficult and responsible calling. If he becomes later a faithful and conscientious physician, his path will not be always strewn with roses, for he must exercise great self-denial: if he does so, he will be a true blessing, but if he does not, he will be an unprincipled man who will cause grave harm and will not find in life happiness for himself. So is it also with the married state. Persons who select the married state must be thoroughly convinced that they are embarking on a life that will demand heavy sacrifices, for *the sacrifices of the marriage state are frequently harder than those of the priesthood*. Any person who is not ready to make these sacrifices should not marry, for otherwise he is preparing lifelong unhappiness for himself and his partner. The sensual man, who seeks only the utmost gratification from life, is not a fit partner for an indissoluble marriage. The fact that there are so many married couples who are highly averse to sacrifices and yet extremely sensual, is the chief cause for Neo-Malthusianism, and thus of marital discord and eventual divorce. Divorces are indeed growing at the same rate as Neo-Malthusianism—a proof that both proceed from the same cause. This is the rule, although here as elsewhere it may be said that there is no rule without an exception.

(3) Moderation of the sexual instinct is the third effective means of combating Neo-Malthusianism. The world of today, it is true, knows little of self-restraint, but on the contrary its aim is to enjoy life to the full. This policy, however, leads inevitably to the ruin of the individual and of human society. To enjoy life to the full in homo- and hetero-sexual fashion was the motto of ancient Sodom and Gomorrha. A rain of fire and brimstone was the result (Gen., xix). To enjoy life to the full and to indulge in every manner of sexual orgy, was the aim of the Romans under the Cæsars. Wholesale massacres with indescribable cruelties and the final downfall of

the Empire was the outcome. To enjoy every sexual pleasure to the full is the aim of all too many modern people. And what is the consequence? Innumerable venereal diseases which, despite the great progress in therapy and the most careful prophylactic measures, are engulfing human society. The desire to enjoy life to the full is the foe of all strength of character. A man who follows this policy becomes the spineless slave of his inflamed passions, which he will satisfy at any cost, even though such satisfaction entails the contravention of God's law—nay, utter ruin for himself.

Hence the necessity of chastity before marriage and of the control of the sex instinct in marriage, especially at the beginning of married life. "Sustine et abstinence" (Sustain and abstain), is a proverb that antedates Christianity, for the advice, as is known, emanated from the ancient philosopher, Epictetus. Unless we manfully follow this advice, it is impossible to lead a life worthy of a rational being. If Adam and Eve had observed the "abstine," we would today occupy Paradise on earth. For the unmarried this abstinence from all sexual lust ensures a joyous, unspoiled youth, an advantage which unfortunately is comprehended by few. Scarcely has puberty been attained than too many feel they must satisfy the sexual instinct. Self-satisfaction is then repeated until the person becomes the slave of his evil habits to the serious detriment of his health and especially of his character-formation. When such a man later contracts marriage, he may for a short time find a natural satisfaction of his exaggerated sex instinct, but soon he will seek for new and greater stimulations. Marriage will be desecrated by Neo-Malthusianism or in some other more serious way. Consequently, our young people must be schooled most carefully in habits of chastity. All conscientious educators are agreed on this point. As to how this ideal can best be attained, there are a variety of opinions which cannot be discussed here. They may, however, be summarized in a single sentence: natural and supernatural means must supplement each other. Judicious physical exercises will, while affording diversion, harden the body. Meanwhile, the young should be kept aloof from the many lascivious allurements furnished by reading, moving pictures, the theatre, evil companions, etc. The supernatural help of grace will be supplied by religious practices, and especially by frequent reception of the Sacraments. Any young

man who has conceived the noble ideal of chastity which brings him pure into the married state, will continue pure in that state, and will not desecrate his marriage by Neo-Malthusianism.

"The lust of sin shall be under thee, and thou shalt have dominion over it" (Gen., iv. 7). This text applies to all married people with respect to sexual lust. The marriage act must indeed be performed at times, for otherwise, as experience shows, estrangement or loveless coldness ensues; but this act must not be repeated too frequently, especially at the beginning of marriage, lest the sex instinct become increasingly impaired with accompanying evil consequences. As a matter of fact, in the opinion of competent physicians many men exceed the sound measure in the use of marriage, and pay little heed to the corporal and mental welfare of their wives: in this respect they are inconsiderate egotists who think only of their self-satisfaction. When it has grown customary by repeated exercise, the sexual act gradually becomes a tyrannical habit that can scarcely be overcome, just as the habitual drinker, the excessive smoker and the inveterate gambler cannot be induced to give up their confirmed habits. Consequently, from the very beginning of marriage the couple should exercise a judicious moderation and avoid all excessive indulgence. Their marital happiness will not be lessened thereby, but will rather be increased and idealized. Neo-Malthusianism then will find no entrance into such a marriage. Should no further increase of children be desired for some truly urgent reasons, the couple will at least limit their use of marriage to the agenesic period (when conception rarely occurs), and will retain sufficient strength of character not to become enslaved to sexual lust. This curbing of the sexual instinct is one of the most effective measures against Neo-Malthusianism, for once the sexual instinct has become exaggerated through too frequent satisfaction and become, as it were, a second nature, it is almost impossible for the couple to observe moderation or continence. Such a couple, however, will not accept the natural consequences of their acts, but become slaves of Neo-Malthusianism. If we had once more married couples who are deeply religious and have cultivated a noble self-control, we would also have chaste marriages with many children—a consummation that would be a great boon for the family itself, as well as for the State and the Church.

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

By C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., M.A.

VII. Non Multi Sapientes: Scientia Inflat

In my last article I dwelt on the need of our "understanding" our fellowmen in order to sympathize with them. Possibly I ought to have insisted that, if we are sufficiently unselfish, we would sufficiently sympathize, and that sort of sympathy simply is "understanding." For such "understanding" you do not need to know a great many things: especially, you do not need to know a number of sordid things, nor what constitutes the normal gossip of the world. "Mrs. X—you know whom I mean. . . ." "I have not the slightest idea." One ought never to be afraid of making that answer. Nor need one know all about physical science, details of history and so forth, in order to make a very good priest.

Indeed, great dangers attend upon accumulation of knowledge, as however they do upon anything worth having. So, in spite of the two texts with which I deliberately headed these pages and in spite of what I have said first, I shall go on to say that, while the presence and power of the Holy Ghost in us more than compensates for any inculpable lack of knowledge of human facts, and while any amount of such knowledge is perfectly useless spiritually without the Holy Ghost, and while packing our heads with human knowledge often leaves no room for the Holy Spirit and also provides us with a quite false perspective and makes us self-satisfied and contemptuous of others, yet, if but the Holy Spirit live and thrive in us, the more we know the better.

Here is one reason. We have to "teach." A good teacher ought to know nine facts he does not mention for one that he does. He has to know just what to select, and to select it from its connected facts. If he tries to get everything in, he simply muddles his hearers; if he does not know more than he says, you instantly "sense" the thinness of his talk. One has to remember that hearers may not know so much about Scholastic theology as a priest does, but they may know a lot more about everything else. A sound knowledge of Scholastic theology is as necessary as a skeleton; but the knowledge of a living man needs a deal more than an accurate knowledge

of his skeleton. There was a time when sermons were full of quotations from the Fathers, even in Latin. It is a good thing to know the Fathers, and would that we knew them, especially the Greek ones, far better than we do! But quotations from Fathers, as from "authorities," interest no one. "St. John Damascene says. . . ." If he says something epigrammatic, likely to "stick" on its own account, because it sounds beautiful or is clever, *transeat*. But if he speaks merely a platitude (and plenty of the Fathers are full of platitudes, and platitudes are indeed about the truest things going), the listener's sole reaction is: "Who on earth is St. John Damascene, and why should I care two cents about what he said, especially about *that?*?"

Our listeners, as we all agree, want solid instruction in the Faith; but they also want the linking up of the Faith with every single part of life that *interests* them. And plenty of our listeners *are* interested or capable of being interested. Many are interested not only in the problems (still sappy beneath their mildew) like Galileo, the Inquisition and so on, that make up so much of our controversy; but in new ones, such as those set by Malta, or Mr. Mencken, or birth restriction. Well, if I may say so, mere denunciation is no good. It is so very easy to denounce, and big words are sonorous and some of us feel daring and that we are "standing no nonsense" and striking blows for the faith if they use them. But our hearers simply will not admit in the backs of their minds that every non-Catholic writer, or even anti-Catholic writer, is a fool or a knave or a wicked man. They may be personally acquainted with them, and know that they are none of the three. They may even contain a percentage of folly, knavery, and blackguardism; but they are more than that. They are hunting for something—sure that the Catholics have not got it; still, they are hunting. Men like Mr. Bertrand Russell, who recently got into trouble in America, most certainly are on the hunt; so is Prof. Julian Huxley—I could mention many others. So, when I met him, was Mr. Sinclair Lewis, but perhaps he no more is: it is in human nature to give up trying if you meet with no belief and no friendly assistance.

I think, then, that we ought each to study, *pro modulo* (for *non omnia omnes*), with the maximum of sympathy such anti-Catholic authors or talkers, and to search for what they are wanting, and

to be so sorry when they skid—and to be even sorrier if they have all the while as it were a defective steering wheel, and to praise them so heartily for what they possess of good. A man like Prof. J. Huxley, for example, has put out hundreds per cent more hard head-work over his special job than most—I fear I must say “most”—of the seminarians I have known put out over theirs. Many of those who attack us put forth all the time their maximum of work, and love to use every moment of free time in order to learn more.

But I would also say that so to study as to find a scrap of evidence that we may “use” effectively in some controversy is to follow a wrong method. In our older books, think of all the quotations from Cicero that you would see supposed to signify what Cicero thought of God—the same, from Plato. The words suited us all right; but those authors did not mean at all what we used them as meaning, or, if they did, they were but putting a case. How often we have read chapters upon, say, the “Pagan World,” describing it in frightful colors, *in order to* show what a bad thing Christianity was up against and how much good it did; and then quite often in another sort of book by the same author or even in a different part of the same book you read an equally lurid chapter about the modern world, from which you would conclude that Christianity had been no use at all. Such chapters are rather the rhetorical statement of a thesis than a good piece of history, and the well-informed reader puts the book down with weariness. A priest has to do such a lot of talking anyhow that it soon becomes easy to knock up a fairly vivacious speech about anything; but unless he knows his subject really well, the speech is “booming brass and clashing cymbals,” and the result disappears with the echo of the words.

Perhaps, too, it is worth remembering that to disprove what is wrong (and even this is never done by violent phrases) is of little value compared to building up what is right. All the more reason for studying continuously in order to “fatten out” our skeleton-knowledge, and achieve that very important thing, “real assent” or personal conviction. Hence a helter-skelter reading of one book (say, on sociology) is but of little value: it is good, when one has read one chapter or one part of such a book to seek another book on the same subject by someone of slightly different mentality and method, and then by someone of quite different outlook and princi-

ples. I think that what usually happens to such readers is, that they develop first an easy-going acceptance of something that seems obvious; then, they begin to guess that there is nothing in the world that can be swallowed whole, let alone totally digested and assimilated; then they may even fall into a panic; they may feel that the ground has been knocked from under them—that they do not know where they are. If *then* they give up, God help them! But if *then* they persevere, wait, get rid of the panic, start again, they are beginning to become of real use, because they will have gone through what those who will need them have gone through or are going through; they will “understand,” they will “sympathize,” they will be of substantial help, and not dealers forth of arid formulæ.

Rather, then, as we have to combine “detachment” for the sake of Christ with real “love” for the sake of Christ (and not entertain caricatures of these, such as not really feeling friendly towards anyone, or again being sentimentally the victim of anyone), so we have to remain quite unperturbed by the multitude of things in this world that are to be known and yet passionately interested in them, since they *are* phenomena of that visible, tangible world that God created and in which souls substantially united with bodies (with nerves, brain, that is, and all the rest of it) move and meet us. If I reduce my counsel to: “Touch not, taste not, handle not”; if I am clearly unfair; if I deny any value in an opponent’s life-work; if I say that “he is a fool—you are a fool,” of or to people who are anything but fools (or even who are), I am minimizing and perhaps destroying my utility, and I am falling short in *one sort* of love. For I must love my fellows in so far, too, as their poor minds are being tormented or puzzled or poisoned.

STAINED GLASS

By RALPH ADAMS CRAM

I already have spoken several times of the importance of this art, and the fact cannot be too strongly emphasized that a good church can be ruined by bad glass, while that of fine quality can almost redeem bad architecture. A church, like any other work of art, must be a unity, and as the architect alone can insure this, he must control the stained glass as completely as in the case of carving or other architectural design or ornament. This does not mean that the subject-matter must be his choice; here the pastor should have the initiative and be the final arbiter, but it does mean that the architect must choose the craftsmen and pass on all design elements. If he is competent to build a church, he will know just who are the best glass-men and also be sufficiently familiar with the art itself, its history, technique, limitations and possibilities. The old days when a completely untrained bishop or priest employed whatever firm approached him with the most dynamic super-salesmanship, or permitted a valued parishioner to make his own choice, both of subject-matter and of manufacturer, are happily gone forever—at least in most sections of the country.

The results of this sort of thing were disastrous. I have in mind one typical case where, shortly before the Great War, a very large church with abnormally large windows was completely fitted out with the most appalling, even incredible glass, and at great expense. The church itself was pretty bad, and it had to be redeemed in some way. After examination the architect reported that it was useless to do anything unless all the glass were first done away with and decent work substituted in its place. This course is being followed, but the result is that the cost of making over the church must be increased by at least one hundred thousand dollars.

During the Dark Ages in America (1830-1880, or in the art of stained glass from the first settlements until about 1900) a vast amount of the most incorrigibly awful stuff was imported into the country, most of it from Germany. The once great art had completely perished about the year 1600, and what had taken its place was too terrible to contemplate. Good glass was not obtain-

able, but churches wanted colored windows and so, perforce, the bad was cheerfully accepted. In many cases these egregious windows were given as memorials, and it became a question how to get rid of them without impiety. There was and is but one way. Go they must unless they were to continue as a scandal to a wiser or at least more cultured generation; so the only thing to do was to remove them as painlessly as possible, substituting others of the same subjects but made by real artists, making these also memorials to the same benefactors whom death had claimed. Certainly this is one case where ruthlessness is justifiable and imperative.

Stained glass is the one great art that the Catholic religion had created *de novo*. All the others had existed since man was man—say for 6,000 to 7,000 years. These the Church took over, giving them a new content but not changing their nature. I enter here a *caveat* as to music, for I rather suspect that this also, prior to Christianity, was different in essence as well as in form. However, the point is that stained glass was in actuality a new art, dating only from the twelfth or at the earliest from the late eleventh century, and it rapidly became one of the most significant and evocative and revealing arts of Christianity. From the first it had its own technique, for it used an entirely new medium, and this it held for three centuries in full force, and then for another three centuries with a gradual loss of integrity until it expired now some three centuries ago.

I need not rehearse the glories of Chartres, Bourges, Le Mans, Poitiers, León, Toledo, Strassburg, Canterbury and a thousand other churches where the Protestant revolution, political revolutions and the mania for "restoration" have still left us vestiges of what was once an unparalleled and almost universal glory. The fame of medieval glass is more secure than its continuance. It was a glory for almost five centuries and its sordid death was a calamity. Now the art has come back, almost miraculously it would seem, and this in itself is one of the wonders of a somewhat astonishing time, for fifty years ago nothing seemed less probable.

The recovery began in England, where also the revivification of ecclesiastical architecture took place. The first evidences showed themselves back in the middle of the last century, under the influence of the Pugins, but the results were inferior to the animating desire.

With William Morris and Burne-Jones the first great forward step was taken, and during the last quarter of the nineteenth century a dozen firms arose in England which created the first really good glass in three hundred years. Manufacture also began in France and Germany, but the product was not comparable in any respect with that which had appeared across the Channel, and in many cases—indeed in most—it was cheap, tawdry and carried out with scant regard to the fundamental principles of the art. This was the sort of thing that was imported in such quantities into America, and which still exists in so many places as a reproach to our recent civilization and a scandal to the Catholic religion.

In twenty years the situation has entirely changed. In England the art has been wholly restored, while in Ireland there is a strong movement towards something less archeological yet built on the sound basis of the old laws and the old technique. Bavaria, which once turned out such horrid stuff that "Munich glass" became a byword even in a degenerate time, has gone back to the same old principles with fine results. In France the old type still remains, generally thin and poor, while the "futurist" sort of thing that came in with the same strange and unwholesome aberration in architecture does violence to every law and to every principle of beauty—let alone the Catholic religion or, for that matter, religion of any sort. Here in the United States the situation is best of all, for it can now be truly said that there are eight or ten firms or individuals that are creating stained glass that is at least on as high a level as the best in England, while some of it is better and not unworthy to be compared with the great French glass of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

It all began some fifty years ago when a really great genius invented a new sort of thing altogether. It had no relationship to medieval glass either in motive or technique, but it had its place—though that place was hardly in a church, certainly not in a Catholic church. As a matter of fact, it never found its way there, being reserved exclusively for Anglican and Evangelical structures. At the moment it was all we had, however, and its vogue was tremendous. When Gothic came back as a creative style, recourse was had to England where alone the right sort of thing was to be obtained. About twenty-five years ago, however, under the

compulsion of the new life in church building, a local development began, and this has gone forward with such remarkable momentum that now it is true to say that the best ecclesiastical glass is produced here in America. Not only this, but almost perfect glass as glass (*i.e.* the material) is being manufactured and of a quality that rivals that of the Middle Ages. Hitherto England alone produced good material, the French and German substitutes being quite impossible. Recently, however, at least one firm in Bavaria has begun the manufacture of real glass, so that, by and large, there is no longer any adequate reason why the devastating subterfuges of the last century should longer be tolerated. Speaking truthfully, it may be said that this restoration of a once great art to full power and value is one of the most miraculous events of modern times.

This by no means implies that one may choose blindly amongst the—I suppose—hundreds of glass-men. The number is limited of those who now are working along the right lines. Only those architects or amateurs who thoroughly know the art should make the choice; yet, as I said before, this is a case where any pastor or benefactor thinks he is in a position to choose as well as anyone else. The results of this line of procedure are only too obvious.

Next to music stained glass may make the most poignant and emotional appeal, but it cannot do this unless it holds faithfully within the fixed laws of its being. In the first place it is not a picture but a space of translucent wall, possessing neither linear nor aerial perspective. Modeling, as in faces and draperies, is of the simplest nature and better done by “tracing” (*i.e.*, by clean lines and hatching) than by “scumbling” or brush-work. Space composition is fundamental, also line composition. In these respects it approaches nearer Chinese or Japanese art than that of the West. Rightly handled, all figures appear with clean, beautiful silhouettes against a clear background. In the very forms, spaces, and lines there must be the quality of a limpid beauty. Of course, color is the very inner essence of stained glass, and this means good materials to begin with, having as nearly as possible the quality of the old glass. The “palette” must be simple: red, white and blue are the basic colors, together with that neutral, warm, purplish brown that acts as a sort of universal solvent for the stronger colors. Two or three pure rubies, as many azures and

whites, are enough and the basis of everything. To these are added several greens and blue-greens, all cool, even almost acid in some cases, and perhaps three yellows, all but one as cold as possible. We have now good purples which hardly existed in the Middle Ages, and these may be used with discretion. There is also a very beautiful but treacherous "gold-pink" and one or two other new shades that may sometimes be employed. On the whole, however, it may be said that red, white and blue are the prime colors, purple-tawny and green secondary, and the others, including yellow, only to be employed sparingly and with the utmost care. Black is not possible under any circumstances.

The juxtaposition of colors is as important as the colors themselves, for each affects its neighbor through "inhalation." A stained glass window is a unity, almost a communal organism, and no color stands by itself. It is this interplay of living light that gives the old work, as at Chartres, its transcendent glory. The influence of one color on another, with the resulting balance, is one of the points where much modern glass fails. It is so important, however, that even subject matter must be considered in relation to its color possibilities or necessities. Realism, therefore, is sometimes, indeed generally, out of the question. Black and steel-grey cannot be used, as I have said; instead, it is customary to employ a deep, dull purple for black and a definite cold blue in place of grey. This question of color balance and composition is one that has to be considered as carefully as must the musical composer consider his use of notes; in fact, a window is really more like a musical composition than anything else in the realm of art. If a start is made from the basis of simplicity both in subject-matter (*i.e.*, number and nature of figures), a limited range of color and not too complicated leading, than there is a good chance of success.

Where possible, as for instance in the case of an entirely new church or one being refitted with a complete line of glass, it is most desirable to work to a consistent and comprehensive scheme. This should be determined by the ecclesiastical authorities in consultation with the architect, and it should be adhered to rigidly, no benefactor, however well meaning, being allowed to interrupt the sequence because he might happen to prefer some special subject.

I have said enough to indicate, I hope, the enormous importance

of stained glass in any architectural unity. Always in the Middle Ages the glass was considered from the beginning as an essential element in the composition; indeed, as is well known, the development of this great art had much to do with the later forms of Gothic, where walls were cut away to the final point in order that as large areas as possible might be available for stained glass. Of course, in the Middle Ages it was not necessary that an architect—or rather a master builder—should control everything, or even that a bishop or priest should assume the same power. At that time Catholic civilization was so one at heart, sense of beauty was so naïve and widespread and ability to produce that beauty so common a thing, that all artists or workmen might safely work along their own lines with unity as a guaranteed result. Now, after fifty years of new artistic Dark Ages, when we are trying to restore at least a modicum of the old artistic sense and power of artistic production, someone has to be in control, and apparently there is no one today except the architect who can occupy this position.

Stained glass is an absolute essential—certainly in any Gothic church—but it is not a cheap product. Only the best can be used, and for full figure work this costs from forty to fifty dollars per square foot. English and German glass of good quality can be obtained for from twenty-five to thirty-five dollars a square foot. Where areas are large and prices such as these are prohibitive, it is possible—in fact, desirable—to use spots of figure work in panels or medallions set in a background of grisaille, quarries or diaper. This considerably reduces the cost, since non-figure work can be obtained for from ten to twenty dollars a square foot. One thing is sure, however, and that is that no substitutes and no cheap or incompetent products can be used. It is better to fill the windows with temporary glass, substituting the final work, window by window, as funds become available. There is now on the market a neutral and very inexpensive material, the best of which is known as “Glastonbury white.” This is of a silvery quality incomparably better than the old type of so-called “cathedral glass” that for half a century was used in this temporary fashion. With this in place, there is always the powerful stimulus to the offering of memorial windows, and it is far better to have a church so fitted than, for the sake of making a big show, to instal inferior products.

THE BEGINNINGS OF SUPERVISION

By PAUL E. CAMPBELL, A.M., LITT.D., LL.D.

The young priest new to parish work finds that he is expected to take an interest in the work of the parish school. He desires to take an intelligent interest. Perhaps his studies in the seminary have not given him a very clear conception of the function he is to discharge in relation to the school. The study of pedagogy in the average seminary is very superficial. Pastoral theology has treated but lightly of the supervision of the elementary school. Entering the school with the best of intentions, he feels very ill at ease and is overwhelmed by the marks of deference shown by children and teachers to his sacerdotal character. The teacher—perhaps a nun who has taught the priest himself in the grades—invites him to take the class and demonstrate the proper method of teaching ten-year-olds the mysteries of fractions. Realizing his lack of preparation and consequent incapacity, he modestly declines the professorial post. To relieve his evident embarrassment the teacher offers to have the children rise and sing a hymn. This partially restores his equilibrium, and he essays to conduct a class in Catechism. The daily assignment of questions and answers is quickly gone over, and, not wishing to repeat these to the point of dull regurgitation, he attempts an explanation of some question of theology suggested by the simple phrases of the Catechism. He finds himself using theological terms that are certainly unintelligible to his audience. But he worries through the task, and leaves the classroom convinced that he is not a teacher of children.

It is indeed sad if this initial failure makes him resolve to leave the education of the children of the parish to the Sisters in the school. Perhaps he takes refuge in making of himself only an assistant truant officer. His work in that direction is not a mistake. His effort to make truant children regular in attendance sometimes brings him into contact with homes that need the visitation of the priest. He will find much absence of pupils due to conditions of chronic sickness and abject poverty in the home. Many zealous parents are struggling against overwhelming odds to give their children all the advantages offered by the parish school. The chil-

dren may go to school with scant clothing and no breakfast, but the parents try manfully to spare them the humiliation of an appeal to a welfare agency. The visiting priest finds that Johnny, who was reprimanded for coming to school with no lessons prepared and falling asleep at his desk, had been on the streets until a late hour running errands or selling papers. He is shocked by the atmosphere of general disorder in the home, but discovers that the mother is a chronic invalid and little Mary in the fifth grade has not been able to keep abreast of her school tasks and the care of the household. The young girl has learned to cook in the hard school of experience; she can boil potatoes and fry eggs, but the family larder has none of these things. The father of the family is out of work, or he dissipates his slender earnings in riotous living.

We do not overpaint the picture. The gentle touch of the priest's hand can put cheerful color into their drab lives. He has an avenue of approach that is closed to the mere social worker. It is not difficult to enter into a happy alliance with a charitable doctor in the vicinity. Between them they can secure hospital care for the physically broken mother and psychopathic treatment for the drunken father. The priest can solicit from little Larry or Lillian in the brownstone front or the fashionable apartment some cast-off garments that the children of the poor will accept from him without embarrassment. At his call the St. Vincent de Paul Society will unobtrusively provide a basket of groceries to relieve the hunger that impedes the academic progress of the "newsie" and his sister, Mary. His little excursion into social relief work is only the beginning of the priest's contact with a family, some of the members of which may be in even greater need of moral regeneration. The priest is learning to love humanity because he has seen much of the good side of it, and he is instinctively drawn to the parish school where he finds in little children the best exemplification of human nature.

His inspection of the school attendance register may reveal on investigation many cases that require more than a mere reprimand for truancy. His interest is stimulating also to the teacher, who may be roused to greater diligence in the minor detail of record-keeping. For in our parish schools the teachers are not required to present an attendance register and class record properly filled out before the salary check is handed over—as they do in many

city and state school systems. The maxim, "No report, no pay," has an automatic effect upon record-keeping. Where the parish school is without the supervision of a superior officer, the records are, to put it mildly, sometimes a disgrace. If the priest asks for the register, it will be kept in good order with complete entries of all required information. There are in some city and state school systems attendance registers that call for a multiplicity of irrelevant details; the accurate recording of these is a perennial monthly nightmare to the distracted teacher. But we have never seen in a parish school system a register that called for unnecessary information.

There is yet another book that should be on every teacher's desk. It is the plan book. There is much discussion about plan books. We debate the merits of the daily plan as compared with the weekly or monthly or semester plan. We discuss the five formal steps of Herbartian planning as opposed to the Froebelian plan or the plan of Pestalozzi. We profess one or other modification of the Herbartian steps. But we sometimes forget that the one essential thing is organization of our work according to approved principles and procedure, and that for the young and inexperienced teacher at least the only safe procedure is the written plan. It is not to be thought that the lesson plan is exclusively a method of teacher-training, or that it is solely an administrative device. The lesson plan is not merely an aid to supervision, nor yet a record of class-work for a substitute teacher in case of emergency: it is primarily a device to insure order in the process of teaching.

It is amusing to note the smug complacency with which some modern writers on educational topics assume that lesson-planning is a modern development. They insinuate that all teaching previous to 1820 was done without a plan. It amazes the mere reader of the history of education who is acquainted with the work of St. John Baptist de la Salle to read that "the professional training of teachers may be said to have begun with the establishment of the first teacher-training school at Concord, Vermont, in 1823." Other writers, with greater honesty or better information, trace lesson-planning back to Plato, who recognized interest as the condition of good teaching and a principle applicable to all life and all the activities of men.

Just a little over a generation ago the five formal steps of Herbart

came to be familiar terms in educational writings. They suffered slight modifications at the hands of enthusiastic American disciples, but the measure of their devotion is shown in these words of McMurry: "Since these steps, namely, preparation, presentation, association, generalization and application, are passed through in this invariable order without reference to the nature of the subject-matter presented, they are rightly called the Formal Steps of Instruction. They indicate the order of the movement of the mind, or of the forms through which thought must pass in reaching full maturity." These steps were quite the vogue. The average teacher of very little or no training went to Summer School, and there fell under the baneful influence of an instructor who threw every lesson into the Herbartian five-step model. Her knowledge of the inductive process was limited to this five-step development catch-phrase. She came home and made lame attempts to cast every half-hour lesson period into the five-step mold—with sad results!

Today there is no one left to do Herbart reverence. Few teachers now favor the five formal steps. Questionnaires reveal that the favored elements in the modern plan are an outline of subject-matter, the details of subject-matter and method, pivotal questions, and a list of items indicating the proposed procedure (Mossman, "Changing Conceptions Relative to the Planning of Lessons," 1924). Lesson plans may and do vary somewhat in form. There are points of agreement. In general, they agree in calling for a statement of the specific aims of the lesson, the subject-matter selected for the purpose, and the pedagogical method employed at each step of the procedure. Subject-matter and teaching procedure are often stated in parallel columns.

There are authorities that assert that no teacher should attempt to teach without a plan. In the sense that even the most experienced teacher should not enter the classroom without a definite idea of what she wishes to accomplish, this is undoubtedly true. But the trained and experienced teacher does not need to prepare a detailed written plan. Her clear knowledge of the purpose of the school, her scholarly command of subject-matter and her consummate mastery of the teaching art give to her the insight and the inventiveness that is necessary to control every classroom situation.

The correct place of the lesson plan is portrayed in the report

of a questionnaire to which replies were received in 1917 from 70 normal schools in 35 States. "All schools reporting," writes Doctor Santee, "require the preparation of lesson plans by the practice teacher. No uniformity exists in these requirements. A few schools require plans in all subjects; more state that the requirement is made in certain subjects only, such as nature study, domestic science and manual training. The period of time covered by these plans varies widely. One week in advance seems to be the most frequent requirement, but one day in advance is common. Other reports of periods covered were: for the entire year; ten weeks; for the entire term; one semester; a unit of subject-matter must be covered regardless of time; one month; and two weeks. A tendency is shown to require formal plans at first; then outlines only, until ability to outline well and teach by outlines is developed; then to reduce the number of plans required." Wilson advocates the simple form of plan in normal schools with a view to habituating students to such plan-writing as will be continued after graduation. He recommends as the least elaborate plan the following under three heads: (1) *What* I am going to teach; (2) *Why* I am going to teach it; (3) *How* I shall proceed.

This plan is often presented under the three sub-divisions: assignment, aim, method. Many pedagogical sins are committed in the name of assignment. In the past the assignment has consisted chiefly in laying out a certain amount of subject-matter to be learned. No word was said of how to learn. Memorize, recite, were the watchwords. The assignment stressed quantity alone, placed the emphasis on the *what*, not on the *how* of learning. Home-work became stupid drudgery, an insufferable burden. The good lesson assignment gives to the child a challenge that makes of study an engrossing occupation instead of a round of dreary boredom. The assignment should be interesting, definite in part and in part indefinite, to develop initiative and originality and to provide for different levels of ability and achievement. It must have unity in itself and demand of the student the organization of ideas. The student can derive the utmost benefit from the ideal assignment only under direction. For this reason the excellence of instruction is measured by the quality of pupil direction which the teacher gives in the period of study. But we cannot at this point consider in

detail the merits of supervised study in school as compared with unsupervised home study.

A teaching aim is a goal of achievement, a statement of a result to be accomplished. The aim of the lesson must be specific and definite. It is not enough to say, "My aim in this lesson is to teach subtraction," but to say, "My aim is to have the pupils master these six subtraction facts."

The plan is the method by which the goal is reached, or the result achieved. The kind of method to be employed depends upon the type of lesson and the aim to be accomplished in the lesson. Frequently a combination of methods will be used in the teaching of one lesson; one method then is predominant. To make her teaching effective the teacher should use those methods that will awaken interest and sustain attention. She should make use of such devices as teachers' manuals and aids, reference books, stories, illustrations, pictures, maps, globes, and charts.

When the assignment, aim and method are thoroughly defined, the outcome is a splendid organization of the teacher's work in the classroom. It is presupposed that the teacher admitted to a classroom has a command of the subject to be taught. A knowledge of methods will suggest the preparation of a few pivotal questions that reveal to the pupils the problem to be solved. The organization of material to solve the problem and the aim established will determine for the competent teacher the correct pivotal thought-provoking questions. Not every pivotal question is prepared ahead of time. The insight and the inventiveness that give the skilled teacher control of every classroom situation may suggest during the lesson questions that better serve her purpose. The perfect plan summarizes the work as the period proceeds. The genius of the teacher will evolve questions that not only involve a summary of the material covered but also stimulate to further thought on the subject. It is evident that properly organized work rejoices in many advantages. It can be adjusted to the capacity of the class, it provides time for the study of individual differences, and it drives directly towards the ideal goal.

Semper aliquid certi proponendum est. This is a maxim that may well be allowed to guide the teacher in her work of lesson-planning. It does not mean that she is not prepared and willing to

take advantage of any opportunity that may arise out of the group study and the group thinking of her class. But the good teacher has a definite goal that may be modified later by developments in the class period, but is in no way dependent upon them. Strayer writes that the older teacher will do her best work only when she has planned as carefully as the novice. Let us be content to say that no teacher is exempt from the law of preparation, and that the written plan is concrete evidence of preparation.

Where is the young priest who began this journey with us? May we hope that he has followed and is still with us? The lesson plan is not solely an administrative device, but it is an aid to supervision. The priest visiting a school may ask to see or to know the plan. The critical faculty of a well-educated man will enable him to judge of the ability of the teacher in carrying her plan into effect. He can see whether or not a definite advance is made. The tyro in the technique of teaching can detect violations of the common sense rules of method which are sometimes forgotten by good teachers.

The teacher should speak in the conversational manner, in subdued, mellow tones that economize her own strength, more easily command attention, and attract her pupils to imitation. In all questioning the teacher should address the class unless some individual has the floor. The general question makes every pupil alert and expectant, and keeps the whole class at work. Mnemonic ostentation deadens group thinking; even the performer lapses afterwards into a state of mental inertia. The teacher need never be sarcastic. She may be always courteous even when delivering a reprimand. A hearty laugh helps the school morale, but no individual should be the butt of school wit and humor. The pupils learn by doing. They should, as far as possible, do the talking. The good teacher will avoid telling anything that can be drawn from the pupils. A correct plan holds the teacher to the task in hand and saves her from diffuseness. She must not become discursive. A hobby is an excellent thing, but it plays havoc with effective teaching when the pupils learn that the teacher can be sidetracked into a discussion of the hobby at any time.

The young priest need not think that his visit as a quasi-supervisor is unwelcome. Only the teacher who has never worked under a supervisor fears supervision.

IV. THE SODALITY CLUB ROOM

By JOHN K. SHARP

Although the general monthly Sodality meeting is essentially worthwhile and important, the far greater part of Sodality work is accomplished only between meetings. A meeting of an hour and a half or three quarters monthly is but little time to give to the active Sodality program. The seed is, indeed, sown at the meetings, the spirit breathed out and inhaled, and the Sodality stewardship outlined and accounted for, but it is only during the month that its ideals are put to practice and its fruits gathered. Obviously, then, there must be some suitable place for the transaction of this business; hence the need of a Sodality club room. Discussion of this place and of the business transacted there will be the burden of this paper.

The club room is not a new idea in parish administration. Parochial history in this country is littered with the wrecks of them, for apparently they have not been successful in many places. In the face of this it requires perhaps a bit of courage to advocate them again. Yet, it does seem that parish club rooms, if properly supervised (negatively, so as to keep out rowdyism, and, positively, by being furnished with ideals and a program) are still desirable. Trouble seems to have come to clubs where lack of supervision and of a program disrupted them. But the fundamental questions of supervision and of program should be a relatively easy matter with a group of young women Sodality members. This follows from the nature of Sodality membership, in which it is difficult even to conceive of hooliganism. It may be useful to mention that, of two Sodalities with which we are more familiar, the better organized conducted no dances. Doubtless, something can be said against such negative attitude. And we have been told that a Washington Sodality conducted mixed dances and had no mixed marriages over a period of ten years.

One successful Sodality fitted up what was once a cold, gray stone and brick storeroom gathering dust and lumber. Walls and ceiling were whitewashed and a board floor put down. Bridge lamps shed varicolored light over grass rugs and easeful wicker furniture.

There were tables for sewing and remailing as well as for card playing, for braille typewriting, and just chatting over. Shelves were built in for selected books and magazines. A cupboard held the crockery for an occasional cup of tea and plate of ice cream. It was surprising how attractively and easily the place was furnished.

Apart from the work done by the little groups of serious thinkers and workers, the club room serves as a social rendezvous and offers a happy and wholesome place for an occasional refuge from the movies and the street. It strengthens the social spirit of the Sodality, and gives the members a better chance to get acquainted with one another and to feel at home with the Sodality apart from its formal monthly meeting. It is open every Friday from 8 to 11 P.M., and is called the Friday Evening Club, deliberately eschewing the word "night." Friday was selected mainly as the best free night for members still at school. Had there been an older Sodality tradition in the parish and more persons interested, the room could be open much more frequently. As it is, frequently as many as one hundred young women pass its portals of an evening. Here committee and officers' meetings are held, and the director invariably drops in to give advice and to say a kind informal word to all. Once a month—on First Friday evening, for instance—a social may be held in the club room at which a member can read a review of the current offering of one of the Catholic book clubs.

Quite a number of activities radiate from the club room. Some actually take place there; others receive their start there. We shall discuss most of the latter in our next two papers on personal holiness and active Catholicity, but there are a few to which we shall now refer, because, while useful in every way, they do not relate strictly and immediately to either personal piety or the active apostolate.

A Sodality can lend encouragement to various courses that some of its members will be glad to take. For instance, many of our public high schools as well as the great public utility corporations give free courses once weekly for three or four months to classes of specified size in cooking and home economics, in home-making and home-keeping. Thus, the Sodality will help to conserve the home in these days when its existence is badly threatened. Such corporations as well as department stores will often place their facilities at the disposal of Sodality groups free of charge for card games and

waffle parties to which admission may be charged. Others, advertising food products, will give free parish suppers. Courses may be had for a minimum charge from the American Red Cross in home nursing, care of sick and first aid. There can also be swimming classes, properly chaperoned, in the large public high schools which cater to such responsible groups weekly. In this connection, the Sodality will be especially blessed if its club room opens on the school playground or suitable space where its younger members may romp, roller skate or indulge in indoor or outdoor baseball, basket ball, folk dancing, and girl scout evolutions. The more talented members can conduct art classes for the making of lamp shades, painting of modernistic vases, and basket weaving. These and the repainted toys and the sewing that is done can be distributed at Christmas time to gladden the inmates of orphanages, homes for aged, and the multitudes of children at our settlements.

Sewing classes will be highly useful in keeping altar linens in repair and supplying new ones. A vestment-making guild can grow out of such a movement. The sewing of aprons, undergarments for children and layettes, as well as more artistic needle work, can be accomplished. This is but another instance of how the Sodality can strengthen the badly shattered morale of the home.

The Sodality choir is another useful adjunct. It can rehearse once or twice a month under the direction of the parish organist, and its services are a boon to divine worship. If the work is seriously done under competent direction, the members will discover that the time given to rehearsals has also resulted in the attainment of a degree of voice culture.

The braille system of transcribing for the blind is another form of work that Sodality members gladly take to. While experience proves that few of those who start persevere, yet, if but one or two become braille enthusiasts for life, it has been worthwhile. Once braille typewriters are purchased, the work proceeds quite rapidly. Practice of an hour a week for a few months gives power to transcribe easily one or two fair-sized books yearly.

Remailing of Catholic periodical literature serves the double purpose of focussing interest on our truly splendid pamphlet literature, and of sending it through the country and abroad as well. Exact postal rates, scales, careful wrapping and addressing are quite nec-

essary. A box placed in the vestibule of the church will serve as a neat and useful receptacle for used Catholic literature. Lists of persons and addresses will be furnished by the International Catholic Truth Society, the America Press, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, etc. The letters received in return from Catholics in the Far East and from non-Catholics in the States on the far-flung battle line are very gratifying to all concerned. Such work gives personal acquaintance with and feeling for the cause of the missions.

Study clubs may also be fostered in certain circumstances in conjunction with Sodality work. They are group meetings for discussion rather than for instruction. Interest, enjoyment and value are readily created out of such activity. They create spontaneous interest in Catholic truth and supplement the religious instruction of the school and the brief weekly Mass instruction. Because of bigotry, false ideas of the Church, marriage and sex and the current attacks on the very foundations of belief and morality, they provide at once a corrective and a preservative. From these groups can grow the rich fruit of lay street speakers. The study club group should be small to start. From two to five members are enough, and it is necessary that each be of approximately the same mental powers and educational background. The N.C.W.C. and the Central Office of the Sodality supply suitable outlines for the intensive study of various topics.

These are some of the many Sodality activities which may be organized from the club room, as well as some of those activities that may take place more properly in it. We shall speak of those which more naturally are accomplished outside of it in subsequent papers.

PROCEDURAL LAW OF THE CHURCH

By STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Lawsuits

TWO CLASSES OF CIVIL LAWSUITS

He who sues in law for the acquisition of an object or some right, relying on a claim or title to it which the law gives him, is said to bring a *petitory* suit—*actio petitoria*.

He who demands of the court the possession of an object or the quasi-possession of a right, is said to bring a *possessory* suit—*actio possessoria* (Canon 1668).

In the petitory action the plaintiff claims title to the goods or rights, ownership in the strict sense of the term; in the possessory action the title or ownership is not at issue but merely the possession or quasi-possession. The statement of facts upon which one bases one's right under the law must necessarily differ in the two classes of lawsuits: in the petitory action one must prove ownership or title by alleging facts which under the law give one title; in the possessory action one must allege and prove facts which show legal right to the possession of a thing.

A plaintiff may bring several cases simultaneously against the same defendant either in the same matter or in different affairs, provided they do not conflict with each other, and they do not exceed the competency of the court. The defendant is not forbidden to make use of several exceptions, even contradictory ones (Canon 1669).

The evident purpose of the concession of the cumulation of claims in one and the same suit against the same person is to avoid unnecessary expense and frequency of litigations. The objects of the different claims need not have any connection with each other, but they may not contradict each other. For if one claim contradicted or excluded another, it is evident that it would be futile to urge both claims. The other proviso—namely, that the plaintiff may bring simultaneously several claims only if they are of such a nature that all are subject to the jurisdiction of the respective court where

the multiple suit is brought—is to be interpreted according to the Canons on the competency of courts (1608-1617).

The defendant is permitted to raise more than one exception or objection to the claim of the plaintiff, even contradictory ones. The contradictory exceptions seem to be unreasonable—for example, if a defendant should object to a claim under contract that he had no contract with the plaintiff and that, if he had, he has satisfied the contract obligation. The defendant may plead such seemingly impossible combinations of exceptions in order to protect himself against all the various reasons on which the plaintiff may base his claim that the defendant is indebted to him.

COMBINATION OF PETITORY AND POSSESSORY ACTION

The plaintiff may in the same instance or action in court bring a possessory and a petitory suit, unless the defendant raises the objection of spoliation. The defendant who is sued in a petitory action can bring a countersuit of a possessory character, and *vice versa*, unless there is question of spoliation (Canon 1670).

Before the conclusion of a case a plaintiff may turn from a petitory action to a possessory action to acquire or regain possession. For a just reason the judge may allow this change of the action even after the case is closed, but before the final sentence. The judge may pronounce sentence on the several actions of a plaintiff in one sentence, considering the pleadings of the parties, or he may decide one after the other, as he thinks best for the speedier and fuller protection of rights (Canon 1671).

In order to simplify the court procedure and avoid repeated actions in court between the same contestants, the Code permits a plaintiff to combine in one action various claims against the same defendant, and he may in the same matter sue for ownership and for possession unless, in reference to the suit for possession, the defendant raises the objection that he has been deprived of possession either by violence or by stealth. The defendant is permitted to bring countersuit against the plaintiff who sues him for ownership of a thing by claiming the right of possession, and *vice versa*, if he is sued for possession, he can bring countersuit for ownership.

To avoid protracted litigation, the Code goes so far as to permit a plaintiff who sued for ownership to change to a suit for possession,

for he may have found out in the course of the trial that he did not produce sufficient proof for ownership and hopes to establish better proof for right of possession. Ordinarily such change can be made only before the conclusion of taking of evidence has been reached, but the Code authorizes the judge to permit the change of the suit even after the taking of evidence has been decreed closed by the court. The foregoing Canons on the cumulation of petitory and possessory pleas in the same action are largely a summary of the Law of the Decretals on the same subject (cfr. *Decretales Gregorii IX*, Tit. "de causa possessionis et proprietatis," II, 12).

SEQUESTRATION OF GOODS AND INJUNCTION

If a person has shown that he has some right over a thing retained by another, and that he is threatened with damage unless the thing is given into the custody of a third person, he has a right to obtain from the judge the sequestration of that object.

In similar circumstances one can get from the court an order enjoining somebody from the exercise of a right.

The sequestration of a thing and the injunction from the exercise of a right can be decreed by the judge *ex officio*, especially at the instance of the prosecutor or the *defensor vinculi*, whenever the public welfare seems to require it (Canon 1672).

The sequestration consists in an order of the judge to set aside property from the possession and control of parties pending the decision of a controversy concerning it. The injunction is an order of court requiring the party to take or usually to refrain from some specified action. When there is question of personal or real goods or property between two litigants and one of them is in possession of the disputed property, the adverse party may have reason to fear that the property will be damaged or dissipated by the possessor before the lawsuit comes to a decision. Now, if the party can prove to the court that he has some right over the property and that there is danger that the possessor do damage to the property, the judge is obliged (for the law says the party has a right to the court order) to issue a decree by which a third party is given the custody of the property in dispute so as to keep it safely until the sentence of the court has determined the respective rights of the litigants. If there is question of the exercise of rights before the court, and the

opponent shows reason for contesting the rights claimed by another and in addition proves that the other party threatens to exercise the right to his damage pending the litigation, the judge is to issue an injunction forbidding the party to exercise the right in dispute.

The Law of the Decretals had the same regulations concerning sequestration and injunction, as we see from several cases decided by the Holy See and recited in the Decretals (*e.g.*, concerning the sequestration of the fruits of ecclesiastical benefices, the appointment of a temporary administrator over a parish or other benefice pending the litigation concerning the lawful possessor of it, the prohibition to a man to live in marriage and the separation of the woman pending the suit for nullity of the marriage, *cfr. Decretales Gregorii IX*, cap. 1, 2, 3, Tit. "de sequestratione possessionum et fructuum," lib. II, tit. 17; cap. 14, "de probationibus," lib. IV, tit. 19).

The judge may without the request of the parties and of his own accord issue a decree of sequestration or an injunction not for the benefit of private individuals but for the sake of the public welfare. The judge's office demands that he favor neither contending party, that he shall not appear interested in either one, suggesting means and methods of attack or defense; he must be absolutely neutral, anxious only to apply the law with justice and to judge according to the proofs that the parties have offered to establish their rights. The prosecutor of the diocese and the *defensor vinculi* (in cases referring to Holy Orders and to Matrimony) are by their office bound to protect the common weal, and they must draw the attention of the judge to matters that affect the common welfare.

Sequestration of a thing is admitted also for the sake of furnishing security for the creditor, provided such claim is absolutely certain, and that the rule of Canon 1923 is observed. The sequestration may extend even to goods of the debtor which are in the possession of others, either as a deposit or under any other title (Canon 1673).

If a plaintiff proves conclusively to the court that he has a claim against another party, and he fears that the debtor may place his goods and property beyond the reach of the court (*e.g.*, by sale, or transfer of title, or removal of goods to another place), the court may order that the goods of the debtor be taken and put

in the custody of a third party for security of payment of the judgment. Canon 1923 treats of the execution of a sentence, and demands that the officer of the court entrusted with the execution and authorized to seize property of the defendant, if voluntary satisfaction of the judgment is not made by him, shall injure the loser of the lawsuit as little as possible, and shall not touch things which he needs for his sustenance and for the exercise of his profession or trade. The same rule is to be observed in sequestration.

The court may by garnishment attach property or other rights (*e.g.*, payment due for contract work, money deposited in a bank, which a defendant has deposited or credited with other persons), and the court will forbid a third party to pay or return the property to the defendant until further notice from the court. The civil courts follow the same procedure in reference to attachment of goods and the garnisheeing of payments due a defendant from third persons or of deposits of moneys in bank.

Sequestration of goods and the suspension of the exercise of a right can never be decreed if the loss which is feared can be repaired in other ways and proper security to repair it is offered (Canon 1674).

The attachment and garnishment proceedings are considered extraordinary means of safeguarding the rights of the plaintiff and must not be employed by the court unless the ordinary means of securing them fail. Besides, as third persons not at all concerned in the litigation are molested by the court in the garnishment order, the law of the Code denies authority to the court (*sequestratio et suspensio exercitii iuris decerni nullatenus possunt*) to adopt those measures when other security is given by the defendant.

The custody of the property subjected to sequestration is to be committed to a reliable person to be designated by the judge at the proposal of the parties; such a person is called the *sequester*.

If the parties do not agree on the *sequester*, the judge shall *ex officio* appoint one.

The *sequester* must use the same diligence in the custody, care and preservation of the property as he would with his own goods, and he must afterwards give the property entrusted to him to the person in whose favor the judge has ruled and with the property he must deliver any interest, increase or fruit of the property during

his custody of the same. The judge may decree a proper remuneration to the *sequester* at his request (Canon 1675).

The person called a *sequester* in the Code corresponds to the receiver in the civil law. The parties, plaintiff and defendant, have a voice in the designation of the person who is to be given custody of property of the defendant. If the two contending parties disagree about the person to be appointed custodian or receiver by the court, the judge is authorized by law to appoint one of his own choice. The man appointed has, of course, the right to accept or decline the appointment, but, if he accepts it, he is in duty bound to take diligent care of the goods or property entrusted to his administration and to render an account to the court. When the litigation is terminated by the court, he receives orders from the tribunal regarding what is to be done with the property confided to his care. The receiver is entitled to remuneration for work done, and he may request payment which the judge may order to be made from the goods given into his care. The amount of the remuneration seems to be subject to the discretion of the judge. It is evident that the court has the right and duty to supervise the administration of the receiver and to hold him liable for losses caused by neglect of the duty he assumed when consenting to the appointment.

INJUNCTION TO HALT NEW ENTERPRISES AND PETITION FOR SECURITY AGAINST DANGER TO ONE'S PROPERTY

A person who fears that he may incur damage through some new work or enterprise may denounce it to the judge and ask that it be stopped until the rights of both parties have been defined by the sentence of the judge. As soon as this injunction to cease operations has been made known to the other party, he must at once stop work, but he may obtain permission from the judge to continue, provided he gives sufficient security that he will restore everything to the former condition if he should lose in the trial. The party who denounces a new enterprise has two months within which he must prove his right to stop the work; this period may be either prolonged or shortened by the judge for a good and necessary cause, after hearing the other party (Canon 1676).

If an old work is being largely changed, the law is the same as stated in Canon 1676 about a new work (Canon 1677).

Any person who fears grave damage to his property from a building belonging to another which threatens to collapse, or from a tree or from anything whatsoever, has the right to institute the action *de damno infecto* to obtain either the removal of the danger or security that the damage will be averted or, if it should perhaps arise, be compensated for (Canon 1678).

The denunciation of some work or enterprise, the complaint against danger arising from a neighbor's property, asking the court to stop a third party from the work or ordering him to remove the dangerous state of his property, are forms of injunctions similar to those spoken of in the Canons dealing with sequestration, attachments and garnishments (cfr. Canons 1672-1675). All injunctions seem to be harsh means of enforcing the real or pretended rights of persons, for they amount in many cases to the taking of property or rights without due process of law. Both in the ecclesiastical and in the civil courts a hearing is to be granted to the persons who are to be placed under an injunction, and they are permitted to show reasons why the injunction should not be imposed; still, it is not a regular trial and the judge is practically free to do as he pleases. Strictly speaking, one has no right of action in law against others who have not actually interfered with or violated a legal right. However, in many instances one could never get full redress of the injury if one had to wait until the other had actually infringed upon one's rights. The courts of law in the United States and in England have no authority to try cases in which no legal right has actually been violated but is merely threatened. The fact that in many instances the court could not fully do justice to the injured party if he had to wait until the injury to him was completed, was one of the reason why equity courts came into existence. Today, if we understand the law correctly, one and the same court sits in law and in equity, but the equity procedure is different from the procedure at law. It may be noted here that against the official acts of ecclesiastical superiors in matters subject to their administrative authority no injunction can be obtained through the courts, nor can one sue for damages in a regular legal action; the only remedy is recourse to the higher superior. A similar rule prevails in civil law, which does not permit private individuals to bring action in court against the Government for damages inflicted in the per-

formance of purely governmental duties. "In order to insure the due administration of government, it is necessary that the officers who are charged with the various duties of making, interpreting, and administering the laws should enjoy a due measure of immunity from being called to account for their public acts at the instance of private parties. Misgovernment is to be remedied at the ballot box, not by suits at law" (Black, "American Constitutional Law," n. 9). Just as the Canon Law does not grant an injunction if the damage threatened can be fully repaired when actually inflicted, so also in the civil law the person applying for an injunction against some one must prove that an irreparable injury will be caused by the other so that the payment of damages would not fully compensate for the harm done.

ACTIONS TO OBTAIN DECLARATION OF NULLITY OF TRANSACTIONS

If an act or contract is invalid by law, the party concerned has a right to sue in court for the declaration of its nullity (Canon 1679).

An act is null and void only when either the essential constituents of the act are wanting, or some formalities or requisites are lacking which the Sacred Canons demand under pain of nullity. The nullity of an act does not make null and void the acts which precede or follow, and which do not depend on the invalid act (Canon 1680).

In the first place, the Code states that a right of action is granted to persons concerned for the nullification of acts, whether contracts or other transactions. The one who sues for a declaration of nullity implores the aid of the court to set aside the transaction and put the parties concerned into the same state as they were before the invalid deal was accomplished. In the second place, the Code explains when and under what circumstances an act is considered null and void. Human transactions may become invalid either because the natural requisites of a valid human act are wanting (namely, sufficient understanding and free will, and, if there is question of agreements concerning things, legal right and power to dispose of the object of the agreement), or because of the neglect of some formality or requisite demanded by Canon Law for the validity of an act. Canon Law is not considered to invalidate an act unless it explicitly states that some formality or requisite is demanded under pain of nullity of the act. Though the law prescribes various

formalities and requisites for transactions, the neglect of these makes the act sinful but does not invalidate it unless the penalty of invalidity is added to the prohibition or precept, as is plainly stated in Canon 11. The declaration of the law that a formality is required for the validity of an act, or that a person is incapacitated from performing certain acts, is to be applied exclusively to the acts covered by the invalidating law and not to other acts connected with the invalid act, provided the other acts do not depend on the invalid act. The principle that no act is to be considered invalid, no person is to be considered deprived of the power to act, unless the law explicitly or in equivalent terms declares nullity or incapacity, is of special importance in canonical elections, in contracts, in Matrimony and other Sacraments.

LIABILITY FOR INVALID ACTS

The person who has performed an invalid act is liable for the damages and expenses of the injured party (Canon 1681).

Under the natural law one is bound to restitution for damages inflicted through fraud or deceit or gravely culpable ignorance in performing invalid acts. The court at the complaint of a party concerning the nullity of a transaction is first of all to determine whether the act was invalid and, if so, to cancel all its effects. The question of damages is to be taken up by the court at the request of the injured party after the nullity of the act has been declared by the court. Since the Code makes the person who caused an invalid transaction to be performed liable for the damages and expenses of the injured party, the court may condemn the party who caused the invalidity even if in conscience he was not responsible for the damages and expenses, for, if he does not succeed in proving to the court that his action was free of guilt and it is proved that he caused the invalid act, he can be held liable by the court for the damages.

The nullity of an act cannot be declared by the judge *ex officio*, unless it is in the interest of the public or in favor of the poor, or of minors or others who enjoy the protection which law gives to minors (Canon 1682).

The court of its own accord is not to inquire into the acts and transactions of private individuals when there is no question of

crime, unless the matter is brought before the court by complaint of some person who has a right to complain, for the public authority is not to be used to favor individuals but is to be ready to defend the rights of individuals when they need its aid and ask for it. An exception to this rule is made in law for the benefit of the poor, of minors, and of other persons who by law enjoy the protection of minors. The reason for that exception is equitable, for neither the poor nor minors nor churches and institutes enjoying the protection of minors have at hand the means of defense of their rights; or if some of them have the means (like minors and institutes), they depend on others for action in court and may not have an alert guardian or administrator. Therefore, the law permits the court to act in behalf of those persons on its own initiative.

SOME ACTIONS OF NULLITY RESERVED TO THE ROMAN PONTIFF

No inferior judge can review the validity of the confirmation given by the Roman Pontiff to an act or instrument, unless he has first obtained a mandate from the Apostolic See (Canon 1683).

There are two ways in which the Roman Pontiff confirms acts and documents, in the common form (*forma communi*) and in the specific form (*forma specifica*). Canonists agree that the confirmation in the common form does not raise the act or document thus confirmed to the dignity of a papal act or document (*e.g.*, the confirmation in the common form of the Decrees of a Plenary Council), but leaves the act or document in the class of acts or documents which they had originally. The confirmation in the specific form, given in the form of *Motu Proprio* or *ex certa scientia* or equivalent terms, makes the act or document a papal one, and, if one wants to raise the question of the validity of such an act or document, no court has authority to rule on the plea of invalidity unless it has first obtained an order from the Roman Pontiff to try the case. The reason is plain, for the act or document has become a papal one and no inferior authority may judge the act of the Supreme Authority (cfr. "Practical Commentary," II, n. 1647).

LITURGICAL NOTES

By THE BENEDICTINE MONKS OF BUCKFAST ABBEY

VII. St. Mark's Procession (April 25)

I. PROCESSIONS IN GENERAL

The word *procession* is found at a very early date in Christian literature. Tertullian (*Ad Uxor.*, ii. 4) uses it to describe the act of going to church and for attending or frequenting divine service. "Never will there be so much to do at home," he writes, "as when the Christian wife of a pagan wishes to go to church (*si procedendum erit*)."

In a more restricted or technical sense, the word is used to describe the concourse of the faithful in a church designated for the *Statio*, and the *Statio* itself came to be called a *processio*. If the faithful thus assembled set out in a body and accompanied by the clergy to visit another church, the ceremonial march was styled a *processio* (a going forth), and if the clergy and people of the church to be visited came out to meet the procession, their action was called *occursus*. Before setting out, the faithful were given a signal by the deacon who called out: *Procedamus in pace*—a custom that obtains to this day. The march of the bishop and clergy from the sacristy to the altar is also called *processio*. Thus, St. Augustine one Easter day, when relating a series of wonderful cures wrought at the Shrine of St. Stephen, after describing the scene in church goes on to say (*De Civ. Dei*, lib. XXII, 8): "They ran to me, where I was sitting, ready to come out in procession (*ad me curritur ubi sedebam jam processurus*). . . . We come out in procession before the people (*procedimus ad populum*)."

Processions are of two kinds—festive and joyful or penitential and funeral. During the first three centuries the only kind of procession possible to the followers of Christ were funeral cortèges; for, as these were not illegal, it was open to the Christians to escort their dead, particularly the Martyrs' bodies, to their last resting place. Such funeral cortèges were, therefore, the first Christian processions.

When peace was given to the Church, there ensued a wonderful expansion of liturgical activities, and among these solemn processions came to be looked upon as an integral part of a religious cele-

bration. We read of such processions—made up at times of the whole population of a city—in connection especially with the translation of the relics of Martyrs, the entry of a bishop into his city, or, for instance, the return from exile of St. Athanasius or St. John Chrysostom.

At a very early stage of liturgical development, besides these joyful and triumphant progresses, other processions came in force which had about them a penitential character and whose object was to obtain spiritual and, perhaps more often, temporal favors. Such processions were known in the East and West alike. St. Gregory the Great ascended St. Peter's Chair in particularly difficult times. Rome and Italy had long suffered from the ravages of barbarian invasions; large tracts of Italy's fair land were reduced to a wilderness; pestilence and famine were for ever scourging the remnant of its population, now singly and now both together. Gregory ordered processions of clergy and people during which prayers and supplications were sung. Hence the word *Rogationes*, *Supplicationes*, for these ceremonial marches through the streets of the city.

In addition to the Psalms, certain invocations were repeated which eventually developed into our Litanies. *Litany* was the proper name for all such penitential processions; not infrequently those partaking in these religious functions would do the whole journey barefooted. In some places the clergy walked at the head of the procession, in others they brought up the rear, and from a passage in *De Civitate Dei* (XXII, 8) it would seem that in St. Augustine's time, or in Africa, the bishop and clergy walked in the middle: *memoriam* (a relic) *martyris . . . episcopus, populo præcedente atque sequente, portabat*.

The Litany or Litanies sung at these penitential processions were based on the litany of intercession which formed an integral part of the Mass. Hence there were invocations to God (the Three Divine Persons), petitions for peace, health, and other temporal and spiritual blessings. These were given out by a priest, or several priests, the people answering *Kyrie eleison*.

After a while the names of the Apostles and Martyrs were also invoked, the people answering *Ora pro nobis*. In all this a gradual evolution was at work, and no date can be assigned to the composition of the Litany of the Saints, which is now the only text sung

or said at our Rogation processions. In early times the *Kyrie eleison* was repeated as often as three hundred times in one procession. The oldest Roman Litany, that of the Gregorian Sacramentary, has 101 names of Saints. A Litany of the Church of Tours in Gaul, of the year 800, contains 300 names of Saints.

II. THE LITANIÆ MINORES AND MAJORES

There are two kinds of Litanies—the *Litaniæ minores* (*viz.*, our Rogation Days) on the three days before the Ascension, first instituted by St. Mamertus of Vienne, in 477, and the *Litaniæ Majores* (also called *Litania septiformis*). This Litany was instituted by St. Gregory the Great and fixed on April 25.

In order to obtain the cessation of the many calamities that afflicted the city, Gregory divided the Roman people into seven choirs or processions. Each group started from a separate church and all met at St. Mary Major; thus, the clergy started from the Church of St. John the Baptist, the virgins from that of Sts. Cosmas and Damian, the poor and the children from that of St. Cecilia, and so forth.

However, it must not be imagined that Gregory was the first to inaugurate the procession. All he did was to reorganize it and give it greater importance by reason of its enhanced solemnity, and he took care, on the preceding day, to preach to the people and to exhort them to throw themselves into the penitential exercise with wholehearted fervor: "Let none go forth into the fields for his worldly occupation; let none presume to undertake whatsoever business; but let us all meet in the Church of the Holy Mother of God, there to bewail together the evil we have all done."

That the procession itself was already in existence is made clear by St. Gregory when he writes (Reg. IX): "The return of an annual devout solemnity admonishes us, dearly beloved brethren, to celebrate with fervent and devout hearts the Litany which all call the *Greater*" (cfr. Martène, "De antiq. Eccl. Rit.," lib. IV, 27). The words *solemnitas annuæ devotionis* suggest a long-established liturgical observance. What, then, occasioned the institution of the Litany and procession in the first instance?

As in the case of the procession of Candlemas Day, we shall probably find in this instance also that the Roman Church sought to wean

her children from the superstitions of some surviving pagan ceremony by substituting a rite of her own which would serve a double purpose if it were made a penitential one.

On April 25 the Romans were wont to celebrate the feast of *Robigo*, the female deity that preserved the corn from blight (*robigo*), *Robigus* being the male deity. The feast consisted of a procession to the shrine of the idol, some five miles outside the city. Those who partook in the ceremony marched out clad in white garments. *Obstitit in media candida turba via*, says Ovid who fell in with the procession on the *via Nomentana* on his return from Nomentum. After prayers and the offering of incense and wine for preservation of the ripening cereals, the *flamen Quirinalis* sacrificed the entrails of a young sorrel dog and a sheep. The whole ritual was, in fact, a grotesque anticipation of our fine and moving supplications for the preservation of the fruits of the earth: *Ut fructus terræ dare et conservare digneris*, the Church prays, whereas the priest of Romulus pleaded in abject terror with *blight* personified and deified:

O bitter Robigo, spare the growing cereals—
 Allow them to grow, until they are ripe for the sickle;
 Spare them, I pray, and keep thy rough hands from the harvest;
 And do not injure the seed; let it be enough that thou hast power
 to hurt!
 Do not touch the crops, but grasp the hard steel
 And thyself first destroy that which might destroy others.
 It will be more helpful if thou seizest hurtful swords and darts:
 There is no need of these, for the world is at peace.
 May the hoe and the mattock and the curved ploughshare shine;
 They are the wealth of the husbandman; let weapons be stained
 from long disuse,
 And should anyone endeavor to draw the sword from its sheath,
 May he find it stuck fast for having been sheathed so long.¹

¹ *Aspera Robigo, parcas cerialibus herbis. . . .*
Crescere, dum fiant falcibus apta, sinas,
Parce, precor, scabrasque manus a messibus sufer,
Neve noce cultis; posse nocere sat est!
Nec teneras segetes, sed durum amplectere ferrum,
Quodque potest alios perdere, perde prior.
Utilius gladios et tela nocentia carpes;
Nil opus est illis, otia mundus agit.
Sarcula nunc durusque bidens et vomer aduncus,
Ruris opes, niteant; inquinet arma situs,
Conatusque aliquis vagina ducere ferrum,
Adstrictum longa sentiat esse mora. . . . (Ovid, *Fasti*, 24 sqq.)

This prayer is striking as revealing the attitude of the pagan towards his gods, and it shows that prayer in the true sense of the word (that is, as an ethical value) is not found in classical paganism. The lines are also interesting in the light of contemporary efforts at disarmament, for we see that the idea is by no means new.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the procession of April 25 was instituted in order to replace some at least of these pagan customs which lingered long after the triumph of Christianity. In the late Middle Ages all memory of the *Robigalia* was utterly blotted out, but the liturgical procession was maintained. The stationary Mass was at St. Peter's. This again shows that the procession is in no way related to the Feast of St. Mark, which was not inserted in the Roman Calendar until about the twelfth century (cfr. Schuster, "The Sacramentary," IV, 116).

A learned writer of the eighteenth century, Moretti, sought to establish that in the fifth, and perhaps already in the fourth century, April 25 was marked in Rome by a special solemnity destined to commemorate the entrance on that day of St. Peter into the eternal city, thereby making of Rome the spiritual capital of the world for all time. In any case, the twenty-five years of Peter's sojourn in Rome would have to be dated from about April in the year 42. The Mass of the day is found in the Leonine Sacramentary.

So striking an anniversary could not fail to interest the faithful—for Peter's going to Rome was one of the greatest events of all history, and the mere thought of so remarkable a coincidence should make them anxious to keep the day with special devotion.

How pitiful it is to see the attitude of so many towards the solemn procession! Surely, a procession in which the people do not take part is a contradiction in terms. Yet, these solemn supplications are precisely for the benefit of the people. Formerly clergy and people alike kept a fast on this day; time was when it was unlawful to undertake servile work, and we have heard St. Gregory telling the Romans of the sixth century that none should go into the fields or to business. The priest's insistence and the example of the more leisured parishioners may bring about an improvement in the attendance, and, if the procession is held at an early hour, there will some day be such a concourse of people as to restore to the chief liturgical feature of the day some of its olden splendor.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

CHRISTMAS MIDNIGHT MASS

Question: The Canons of the Code say that Midnight Mass may be celebrated in all parochial churches and in religious and pious houses on Christmas Day. Some say that it is necessary to apply each year to the Ordinary for permission to have the Midnight Mass in parish churches and in religious and charitable institutes, even though there is no diocesan regulation for or against it. Pope Pius X, as far as I know, gave permission to all religious and charitable institutes where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved to have the Christmas Midnight Mass and to all who assist the privilege of receiving Holy Communion. He made no mention of the necessity of obtaining the Ordinary's permission each year, nor did he say that it was to be a High Mass. What is the law on these points?

SACERDOS.

Answer: The points mentioned by our correspondent have been discussed repeatedly in the pages of THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW. The time when Holy Mass may be said is regulated by the general law of the Church, not by ecclesiastical authorities inferior to the Holy See. Canon 821, §3, is explicit in allowing religious houses and ecclesiastical institutions (seminaries, colleges, academies, hospitals, homes) to have Midnight Mass and to give Holy Communion at that Mass to those present. The concession is, of course, for the benefit of the inmates of those houses and institutes, as is evident from the very nature of semi-public chapels. No permission of the local Ordinary is required to have Midnight Mass on Christmas in those chapels, for what the Supreme Authority concedes does not need the additional permission of the inferior authority, nor can the inferior forbid what the superior permits. The concession is, as we remarked, for the community, college, hospital, etc., and not for the general public, and the Ordinary may forbid the admission of the public if he thinks it advisable to keep them out.

In parish churches the Christmas Midnight Mass may be said or chanted, and there is no need of obtaining the Ordinary's permission because the higher authority permits it. Does it follow necessarily that the inferior authority, the Ordinary of the diocese, has no right to stop the Midnight Mass? No, that does not follow because of the other principle by reason of which the Ordinary of the diocese is responsible for the proper conduct of divine worship in his diocese, and no matter what concession the Holy See makes, either general (as the Midnight Mass) or particular (*i.e.*, to an in-

dividual church, person, etc.), it is understood that if the concession concerns the public worship, and especially Holy Mass, the Ordinary is the judge as to the circumstances which may interfere with the proper celebration of Holy Mass, and, if so, it is not only his right but his duty to forbid divine services being conducted at midnight. The Council of Trent (Session XXII, Decree on the Things to be Observed and Avoided in the Celebration of Holy Mass) made it quite clear that the bishop should regulate all matters of public propriety concerning the celebration of Holy Mass, and it is evident from the very nature of the bishop's office that he has the supervision over the divine worship in his diocese.

Concerning the distribution of Holy Communion during the Midnight Mass in parochial churches, the canonists do not agree whether the Code permits it. Nothing is said about Holy Communion in the Canon that speaks of the Midnight Mass in parishes, while permission to give it is explicitly mentioned where the Midnight Mass in religious houses and other ecclesiastical institutions is spoken of. There is, however, a general principle expressed in the Code (Canon 867, §4) to the effect that Holy Communion may be given at those hours when the saying of Holy Mass is permitted. The Committee for the Authentic interpretation of the Code answered the Bishop of Tuguegarao, Philippine Islands, that it was permitted to distribute Holy Communion, but the answer has never been published in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* (cfr. *Epitome Iur. Can.*, 4th ed., II, 111).

OBLIGATION OF THE MASS FOR THE PEOPLE IN POOR PARISHES

Question: Is the obligation of the Mass for the people of the parish an obligation *ex caritate* or *ex iustitia*? In any case, does the obligation actually rest with the pastor in those parishes where the total yearly income is so small that, after paying all the expenditures of the parish, the pastor does not have enough money on hand to draw the full salary to which he is entitled under the statutes of the diocese? Some pastors in those circumstances think themselves excused from at least part of the number of Masses to be applied for the parishioners in proportion to the income they are able to get from the parish; others hold that the pastor could not reduce the number of Masses without the authority of the bishop. However, if the condition of those parishes were brought to the notice of the bishop, his decision as a prudent and fair-minded man could not be otherwise. Wherefore, it seems useless to trouble him with an affair that one can decide for himself.

PAROCHUS.

Answer: The Church considers the obligation of the pastor to apply the Masses for the parishioners an obligation of justice. In

fact, the Council of Trent derives the obligation from the divine law in reference to the bishop of the diocese, and, inasmuch as the pastor of a parish participates in the pastoral care of the bishop, the pastor's obligation to offer the Holy Sacrifice for the people is indirectly derived from the same law. The salary of the pastor is to make his service for the people possible, and St. Paul's well-known teaching on the point that he who serves the altar is entitled to sustenance, applies in a special manner to the pastor. Our correspondent asks whether the obligation to say Mass for the people on the days specified in the law of the Church is perhaps totally or partially suspended when the pastor cannot on account of the poverty of his parish get the salary to which he is entitled. As far as we know, the Church does not admit the poverty of a parish as an excuse from the obligation (cfr. Sacred Congregation of the Council, July 13, 1918; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XI, 46). The bishop has no authority to release the pastor from the obligation imposed by the general law of the Church, but he can, we believe, get permission from the Holy See to relieve the pastor of poor parishes from the obligation in whole or in part according to the circumstances, for the Holy See will not fail to do what is fair and equitable under the circumstances.

TABERNACLE VEIL

Question: Is it required by law to use an outside tabernacle veil? Is it necessary to use a veil of the liturgical color of the day, or may not a gold lace serve the purpose throughout the year? Is it an obligation *sub gravi*? Should it be considered a grave omission to leave the tabernacle entirely without an outside veil for three or four months?

READER.

Answer: The rubrics of the Roman Ritual and several Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites demand a covering of the tabernacle. They call the covering a canopy, which suggests that the entire tabernacle is covered. The construction of most altars in the United States which we have seen makes it impossible to cover the whole tabernacle. The veil over the front of the tabernacle is the next best thing that can be done. Some priests are of the opinion that, when the door of the tabernacle is gold plated, no veil is required. That is a mistaken idea, for the Sacred Congregation of Rites has declared that, even if the tabernacle is made of silver or gold or other precious material, it must be covered with a veil (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 3520). The material of the veil need not

be silk; the color may be white throughout the year or may change with the color of the day (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 3035); but, if a Requiem Mass is chanted at the Altar of the Blessed Sacrament, the veil of the tabernacle must be purple (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 3562). The inside veil is tolerated, not prescribed (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 3150), and from practical experience we conclude that it would be preferable not to have an inside veil. Why Génicot and other moralists say that, if there is a custom not to have the tabernacle veiled, such practice may continue (cfr. Génicot, *Theol. Moral.*, ed. 1927, II, n. 183), is difficult to explain in view of the fact that we have an explicit declaration of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, July 1, 1904 (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 4137), that the custom may not be tolerated and that the Ritual and the Decrees on the matter are to be observed.

Regarding the other question of our correspondent whether the precept concerning the tabernacle veil obliges *sub gravi*, we do not get much light from the moralists, but we would say that it should not be considered so great and serious a matter as to call for a precept binding *sub gravi*. It is not advisable to multiply mortal sins, for venial sins are serious enough to a soul that honestly tries to please God.

LAST BLESSING IN ARTICULO MORTIS RECEIVED IN A STATE OF SIN

Question: If a person received the last blessing in danger of death in the state of sin or fell into mortal sin after having received the blessing and had to be absolved again, would the blessing still be good? The question is answered in an article in the January issue of THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW, page 411, in the affirmative. Is that true in both cases here mentioned?

PAROCHUS RURALIS.

Answer: The last blessing to which the Church attaches a plenary indulgence to be gained at the moment of death differs very much from the ordinary indulgences that the faithful can gain in various ways for themselves or for the souls in purgatory. As that papal blessing *in articulo mortis* is regulated by special rules, the ordinary rules on indulgences given in the Code of Canon Law do not apply. If they did apply, our correspondent would be right in doubting the correctness of the above-mentioned statement as to receiving the indulgenced blessing in mortal sin and still gaining the indulgences when the state of grace is recovered. The indulgence *in articulo*

mortis is not gained at the time when the sick person complies with the requisites for the indulgence and gets the papal blessing as contained in the Roman Ritual; it is gained only at the actual moment of death (cfr. Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, September, 23, 1675), and the person must, of course, be in the state of grace at that time to gain the indulgence. The papal blessing *in articulo mortis* may not be repeated in the same illness, even though there may be reason to repeat Extreme Unction in a protracted illness and recurring crises; and it may not be repeated even though it was given while the patient was in mortal sin, or though he fell into mortal sin after it was given to him, as is explicitly stated in the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences of June 20, 1836. The reason seems to be that the actual application of the indulgence does not take place until the last moment of life.

ECCLESIASTICAL BURIAL FOR NOTORIOUS CRIMINALS

Question: What is the priest to say to people who ask him why it is that the Catholic Church grants ecclesiastical burial to notorious racketeers, as has been done repeatedly in recent times?

VERITAS.

Answer: Not only do the common people wonder how it is that these people are buried with great pomp from Catholic parish churches, but even the theologians who read of the account in the papers are asking themselves the same question. It is good to be merciful to all and especially at the hour of death, for we ourselves who by the grace of God try to lead a good Christian life do not know what a moment of temptation may do to us, and possibly that fall into sin and the hour of death may be so closely connected that we barely have time to cry to the Lord in our hearts for forgiveness. The Saviour Himself had pity on a notorious criminal who paid the death penalty alongside of His own Cross of atonement for the sins of the human race. We wished to preface our remarks with these reflections to profess our belief in the all-merciful God to whom the value of the human soul is so great that even the blackest sins and crimes do not deter Him from the desire to have that soul with Him in a happy eternity, if only that soul will give Him a chance to apply to it the redeeming grace of His Son. Nevertheless, it is one thing to judge kindly of a criminal and hope that he did sincerely cry to the Lord for forgiveness when in the grim light of death he saw the

folly of his ways; but it is another to honor him with all the sacred rites of a respectable, faithful Christian soul. Even if it is known that a notorious criminal in his last moments did call for the ministry of the Church whose every rule and regulation he had spurned for many years, and even though that repentance were made public, it does not seem right to the average man when such a criminal is given the same honors of Christian burial as are given to the faithful Christian man or woman. But one may object and say that the law of the Church entitles the worst of criminals to a Christian burial if he dies a repentant death and his repentance is made known. Canon 1240 certainly does say that the various criminals mentioned there may be given ecclesiastical burial if they gave signs of repentance before death; it further states that in case of doubt the Ordinary is to judge whether he is to be denied ecclesiastical burial, and that in doubt whether he is to be buried from the church, ecclesiastical burial should be granted *provided scandal is removed*. It is almost impossible to avoid scandal in the case of notorious criminals who finally die in a gang war. The Christian sense of propriety seems to be offended by public and solemn church functions at their funeral. If they repented, let the quiet funeral from house to graveyard be part of their penance and a sign of our detestation of a criminal life that causes bloodshed and murder and endangers the public peace.

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

CASUS MORALIS

Marriage Before a Non-Catholic Minister

By WILLIAM V. GREENE, C.S.S.R., J.C.D.

Case.—John confesses that he married Mary, a Catholic, before a non-Catholic minister. He mentions that he knew at the time the excommunication which the Church attaches to such an attempted marriage, as he had heard in a sermon that any Catholic who married outside the Church is excommunicated. The confessor tells John that he must have misunderstood the preacher, since there is no penalty contracted when both parties are Catholics, even though they commit a serious sin. John has all the necessary dispositions and receives absolution.

(1) Who are excommunicated for a marriage outside the Church?

(2) What of John's case?

Solution.—Canon 2319, § 1, n. 1, declares that Catholics who enter marriage before a non-Catholic minister, contrary to the prescription of Canon 1063, § 1, are under a *latae sententiæ* excommunication which is reserved to the Ordinary. The paragraph of the cited Canon (1063) is as follows: "Even if a dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion has been given by the Church, the couple may not, either before or after their marriage in the eyes of the Church, whether in person or by proxy, also go to a non-Catholic minister as a representative of religion for the purpose of giving or renewing consent."

There are certain points that are clear in these paragraphs. For example, since the penal Canon refers only to the first paragraph of Canon 1063, the excommunication is incurred only by those who give or renew matrimonial consent in the presence of a non-Catholic minister, and that in his confessional capacity. If the said consent were to be given and accepted in the presence of a civil official, even though the Civil Law did not demand such an action, no excommunication would be incurred by reason of this Canon. This is clear from the text. It will be likewise noted that only Catholics are punished by the censure of this Canon, the baptized non-Catholic not being liable to the punishment.

The wording of the penal Canon does, however, cause one great

source of disagreement among the authorities, *viz.*, whether or not two Catholics who would attempt to marry before a non-Catholic minister, as mentioned above, would be excommunicated by this Canon. It is certain that such an action is forbidden, but it may not follow that this procedure is penalized by this excommunication.

Chelodi (*Jus pœnale*, p. 66, note 3) declares expressly that two Catholics who attempt to marry in this way do not come under the penalty of this Canon. This opinion is also followed by Cerato (*Censuræ Vigentes*, p. 93), for he says that he doubts very much if the censure would be contracted if both the parties were Catholics. In his "Moral Theology" (III, n. 522), Pruemmer follows the same opinion as these authors. Woywod writes: "The Code does not punish this offense of two Catholics with a *latæ sententiæ* penalty" ("A Practical Commentary," II, p. 472).

This opinion is based on the context of Canon 1063. The Canons which precede and follow this one deal with marriages between Catholics and baptized non-Catholics, and the prohibition is launched chiefly—not to say wholly—against what might occur, *viz.*, that the parties in such a mixed marriage might appear before a non-Catholic minister for the sake of the non-Catholic or to pacify the relatives of this individual. Another reason underlying this view is that we are not permitted to argue *a fortiori*, when it is a question of penalties. Canon 2219, § 3, declares: "It is not allowed to extend a penalty from person to person, or from case to case, although an equal, or even graver, reason be present."

There are other authors who hold that, even though both parties are Catholics in a marriage of this kind, the censure is incurred. Cappello (*De Censuris*, 1st ed., n. 125) and Blat (*De delictis et pœnis*, n. 157), treating of the penal Canon, say that the censure affects even two Catholics contracting marriage in this manner. Augustine, commenting on Canon 2319, writes: "It is, of course, immaterial whether one or both parties belong to the Catholic faith" ("A Commentary on Canon Law," VIII, p. 18). Ayrinhac, I think, follows this opinion; for, though he merely translates Canon 1063, the manner in which he transcribes it shows that he considers the censure to be incurred by two Catholics ("Penal Legislation," n. 213).

Apparently these authors think that this view is evident from

the reading of the Canon, since they offer no reason for it. There is, nevertheless, reason for this opinion. It is founded on the wording of the paragraph indicated in Canon 2319, § 1, n. 1, as well as the intimate connection which this paragraph has with the succeeding ones. Canon 1063, § 1, quoted above, begins with the conjunction "*etsi*." The natural reading of this paragraph indicates that Catholics are always forbidden to attempt marriage or renew matrimonial consent in the presence of a non-Catholic minister, acting as a representative of religion; and that this prohibition is present *even though* they have received a dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion. The other two paragraphs of the Canon bear out this understanding of the text, for they express general norms of action; in the first place, where the pastor foresees that the law forbidding presence before a non-Catholic minister will be violated or has been violated; and also, where the State demands that all marrying couples go before a non-Catholic minister as an official of the State. The argument of context, cited by the opposite opinion, does not affect this understanding of the Canon. This Canon (1063) does find its place, and very logically, among the Canons that treat of mixed marriage; for it is in such cases that the danger of going before a non-Catholic minister would normally occur; but the legislator takes this occasion to lay down a general norm to be observed in all cases. Admitting this line of reasoning, it cannot be urged that the argument is *a fortiori*, which is not allowed when dealing with penalties. The penalty affects everything that comes under the first paragraph of Canon 1063, and this paragraph certainly implies a prohibition for two Catholics to attempt marriage before a minister of another religion.

The opposite opinion, however, has good authorities for it; and Canon 2219, § 1, would apply: "In penalties the milder opinion is to be followed." Two Catholics who would contract such a marriage would not be excommunicated by virtue of the Code.

In the United States, however, there is an excommunication attached to the attempted marriage of two Catholics before a non-Catholic minister. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (n. 127) determines: "We decree that Catholics, who have contracted or attempted marriage in the presence of a minister of whatsoever non-Catholic sect outside their own diocese, in any

State or territory under the rule of the Prelates who are present or should be present at this Council, incur an excommunication reserved to the Bishop, from which, however, any of the aforesaid Ordinaries, either personally or through a delegate, may absolve. If they commit this crime in their own diocese, we determine that they are thereby under an excommunication which, unless they approach another Bishop without fraud, is reserved to their own Ordinary." The attempt at marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic under the circumstances of which we have been speaking is penalized by the Canon under consideration, so in this matter the Council has been superseded by the Code. The penalty for the case of two Catholics remains in force.

Canon 2319, § 1, n. 1, refers only to Canon 1063, § 1. Cerato (*op. cit.*, *ibid.*) would on this account rule from the penalty those who contract marriage in the way mentioned with non-baptized persons. Chelodi (*op. cit.*, *ibid.*), on the other hand, says that the censure is incurred even when the marriage is attempted or consent is renewed with an infidel. This would seem the better opinion, since Canon 1063 embraces also the cases of marriages of Catholics with non-baptized persons by virtue of Canon 1071, which orders that the norms of Canons 1060-1064 are to be applied to the marriages between Catholics and persons who are not baptized.

Woywod maintains that, if only the ceremony before the non-Catholic minister takes place, the penalty would not bind. He says: "It seems to be quite certain from the wording of these two Canons that it is the double ceremony which is punished with the excommunication of the Code" (THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW, XXIV, p. 510). This is also the opinion of Génicot-Salsmans (*Theol. Mor.*, II, 9th ed., p. 564). This is a strange opinion, as in such a view the crime would be considered as not consummated until the parties presented themselves before the Church, and ordinarily this would be done in order to have the marriage rectified.

We presume that John's case takes place in the United States. On account of the opinion defended by Chelodi and others, he is not excommunicated by virtue of Canon 2319. The confessor was undoubtedly following this view. The confessor, however, has neglected to consider the penalty of the Council of Baltimore. John has attempted marriage before a non-Catholic minister acting in

his religious capacity. John is, therefore, under the excommunication inflicted by the Council. He has admitted that he knew of the penalty. The censure is reserved to the Ordinary, but any bishop or his delegate may absolve from it, even though John leaves his own territory for the very purpose of receiving absolution (Canon 2247, § 2). The action of the confessor is valid, presuming that he absolved from censure and sin. Canon 2247, § 3, says: "If a confessor, ignorant of a reservation, absolves a penitent from censure and sin, the absolution from the censure is valid, unless the censure is *ab homine* or most specially reserved to the Holy See."

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUR READERS

"Gallopers" and "Sprinters"

By THE RIGHT REV. MSGR. JOHN L. BELFORD, D.D.

One of our ecclesiastical periodicals carried recently an article on "gallopers." This name the whimsical author applied to priests who say Mass in a hurry, or in much less than the time decency demands. While he was somewhat caustic in his remarks, he was so humorous that the criticism really became a kindness. No doubt he was wise enough to know that ridicule often persuades men whom scolding only angers.

The trouble with the galloper is that he thinks he is doing the right thing, or at least the popular thing. As a rule, he is a vain person. He delights to hear the approving remarks of young people who are as silly as he is. He loves the incense of praise that comes to him in the shape of observations like these: "That was some Mass!" "No grass grows under *his* feet!" "If the 'old man' saw him this morning, he would have a fit!" "Gee, see his smoke!" "Eighteen minutes flat!" "That boy is a sprinter!" Then, when he meets these boosters—usually they are not hard to find—he receives encouragement from their compliments. They tell him what a pleasure it is to go to his Mass; to see him skate through the service; to know that, when he comes out, there will be no time lost.

But what do the sensible members of the congregation do and say? No doubt they say very little to him. But they think plenty, and say plenty when they see fit to speak at all. They must wonder whether that young man—though all the gallopers are not young, one of the worst we ever saw was a bishop!—whether that young man realizes that he is performing a sacred rite, that he is renewing or continuing the sacred act of man's redemption, that he is saying the sublime words and performing the august action of Christ Himself!

Confine the criticism, if you will, to the recitation of the preliminary prayers, the Epistle and Gospel, the Creed, the Prayers at the Offertory. How can a man who believes that these are taken from the inspired writers to whom the Holy Spirit Himself whispered the divine message, or from the lips of the Saviour who used His words to inspire human thought and control human conduct, how can such a man recite them without reverence and with such speed that one word runs into another making a jumble unintelligible to anyone, even the celebrant? How can any one who knows what the Nicene Creed is recite it without some thought of the sublime confession of faith it contains, or recite the Offertory Prayers, which he addresses to the Lord Himself, in a way which a business man would not tolerate in his secretary or ■

General permit in his Orderly? The further we proceed with the sacred rite, the worse becomes the sin of the galloper, until it is consummated in the gulp of the Communion.

But his sin is not confined to words or recitation. It appears also in his actions and gestures. He bursts out of the sacristy as if he were going to a fire, a bargain sale or a ball game. The altar boys have to run to keep ahead of him. He spreads the corporal and slams the chalice down. He opens the book with a bang that can be heard at the back of the church. He snaps the leaves out of the binding or tears them into tatters. At the Offertory he does not pour the wine; he dumps the cruet! He flings the towel at the acolyte, who must be a good catcher to keep it off the floor. At the Communion he tosses the altar card aside, knocking over perhaps a candlestick or a vase; throws open the tabernacle door with a force that makes the hinges creak; pulls out the tabernacle corporal with the ciborium; bangs the ciborium against the tabernacle twisting or bending the cross which surmounts it, takes off the cover and sends it rolling along the mensa or falling to the floor. He gives Communion as if he were distributing potatoes, mumbling something that even an angel could not understand. He carries his roughness, rudeness and impetuosity to the very tongue of the communicant. He breaks the Sacred Host often, and, not infrequently, drops It as he practically throws It onto the tongues of the bewildered and horrified people! But he shines in the Prayers after Mass. We defy any one to follow him in these prayers, in which not only is reverence lacking, but even courtesy, good taste, distinctness and intelligibility are totally missing.

Does such a man realize he is addressing, not a lady or gentleman, but God Almighty and the Saints? If he does, his sin is far worse than irreverence, for he is making a mockery out of religion and giving an example that cannot fail to scandalize the worshippers.

While the worst of the evils such a man does is spiritual, the results do not end there. He leaves behind him a trail of broken furniture, torn vestments, bent and broken vessels, faulty records and offended people. Of him it may be said that he touched nothing that he did not spoil.

Is there any cure for him? He represents, of course, a class. For some of the class there is a remedy, and, if they have any sense, an effective one. It is candid but kind criticism. Choose an opportune time, place and mood, and quietly point out the fault and its deadly effects, and beg the offender to think the matter over before God and change his manner of acting. It may be necessary to do this more than once, and it may require increasing firmness and emphasis. If he is incorrigible, there is only one thing left: lay the matter before the bishop and ask him to give the gentleman a lesson by sending him to

some other place where less desirable circumstances will hourly remind him that he is paying a penalty for his speed mania, and especially for his obduracy.

In the case of others there is no cure. They are convinced that they are right and they resent criticism. With the least possible delay these should be sent to the least desirable places where solitude or privation may in some way convert them, or where at least a small congregation may minimize the scandal they give.

But where shall we place the blame for this bad habit? Naturally, we turn at once to the Seminary. Who ever taught these men to say Mass, and who examined them and testified that they were duly qualified? Now, the Seminary is not responsible for everything. The Lord knows it has its share of trouble, and that trouble begins with the material it receives. Perhaps we should say that it begins with the choice of the men who were appointed to teach in it, for in many seminaries the teachers are grossly inefficient. The fact that a man has been ordained a priest does not qualify him to teach in any school or seminary. We all know what the Lord said about the blind leading the blind.

The "professor" who does not know how to say Mass properly cannot teach a student to say Mass. Where the "professor" is wanting in reverence or even in intelligence, his defects will appear in his students. But grant that the teacher is really capable, and has the veneration for the priesthood which is essential, he "cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." But, if he cannot, how is it that he does not say so, and place the responsibility squarely where it belongs? In fact, why is it that the seminary may not set its own standard for admission, conduct its own examination, and on the strength of that examination accept or reject all applicants? Not so many years ago the President of a preparatory college in one of our great Eastern cities complained that the Rector of the Seminary was discriminating against his graduates. In answer, the Rector sent him the examination papers of the said students. Needless to say, the President made no further complaint.

The trouble is that too many young men are admitted because they are "good boys": they are recommended by excellent priests; their families are very respectable, and they will be disappointed or disgraced if their son is rejected! For heaven's sake, what about the Church? Has she no claim? Is not the good of religion paramount? If the Lord blamed the Jews long ago because they presented sick, lame or deformed victims for the sacrifice, will He not—does He not—blame us for admitting to the sanctuary unfit candidates?

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

NEW PONTIFICAL DUTCH COLLEGE AT ROME

Last year in the month of May the cornerstone for the Dutch College was laid at the foot of the Aventine Hill, and now that the building is ready to receive students the Holy Father Pope Pius XI formally erects it as a Pontifical Ecclesiastical College, places it under the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, and tells the Bishops of Holland that he blesses the undertaking and wishes it all success. The Rector of the College is to be appointed by the Supreme Pontiff through the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, and he will be the procurator of the Bishops of Holland and have parochial jurisdiction over the College (Apostolic Constitution, October 26, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 5).

FIFTEENTH CENTENARY OF THE COUNCIL OF EPHEBUS

The Holy Father writes to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome concerning the solemn commemoration of the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Ephesus celebrated under Pope Celestine I, in which the glorious title of "Mother of God" of the Blessed Virgin Mary was endorsed by the Council against the heretic Nestorius to the great joy of the Oriental and the Western Church (Letters of His Holiness, December 25, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 10). Another letter of the Holy Father of the same date is addressed to Cardinal Sinicro, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, in which he speaks of the great importance of the Council of Ephesus, and urges that a fitting commemoration of the fifteenth centenary be arranged for at Rome.

ADDITIONS TO THE INDEX

The work of Guillermo Dellhora, entitled "La Iglesia Catolica ante la critica en el pensamiento y en el arte" (published at Mexico, Ediciones Dellhora, 1929), has been placed on the Index of Forbidden books (Holy Office, Nov. 28, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 13).

An article entitled "Messianisme," contained in the "Dictionnaire de théologie catholique" (published at Paris by the Librairie Letou-

zey et Ane), and a book of the same author entitled "Le Messianisme" (published at Paris by the Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 1929), have also been placed on the Index of Forbidden Books (Holy Office, December 16, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 14). After the condemnation of the above-mentioned writings, the author, Rev. Ludovic Dennefeld, informed the Holy Office that he regretted his errors and is willing to change and correct the same.

TITLE OF "HIS MOST REVEREND EXCELLENCY"

The Sacred Ceremonial Congregation rules that the title of "His Most Reverend Excellency" is to be given not only to Patriarchs, Apostolic Nuntios and Internuntios, but also to the archbishops and bishops, and to various other prelates of the Roman Curia enumerated in the Decree (December 31, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXXIII, 22).

INDULGENCED INVOCATION TO THE "QUEEN OF APOSTLES"

An indulgence of 300 days has been granted for the recitation of the invocation, "Queen of Apostles, pray for us" (Sacred Penitentiary, Nov. 20, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 23).

PLENARY INDULGENCE FOR RECITATION OF THE DIVINE OFFICE BEFORE THE BLESSED SACRAMENT IS EXTENDED TO NUNS

The plenary indulgence which was granted by Pope Pius XI on October 23, 1930, to the clergy reciting the entire Divine Office in a church or chapel where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, has been extended to religious women who by their Constitutions are bound to recite the Divine Office (Sacred Penitentiary, Dec. 5, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 23).

OFFICIAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CODE

(1) *Concession of Indulgences by Bishops*.—To the question whether the phrase of Canon 349, §2, n. 2, "in suæ iurisdictionis locis," is to be understood in such a sense that the bishop is forbidden to grant indulgences to exempt religious or to their churches, the answer is that he is not forbidden.

(2) *Legitimation of Offspring*.—To the question whether in vir-

tue of Canon 1116 subsequent marriage makes a child legitimate that was born at a time when its parents were under the impediment of age or of disparity of cult, which impediment had ceased at the time of marriage, the answer is given that the subsequent marriage does not make the child legitimate (Committee for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code, December 6, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 25).

NEW PAPAL SEAL

By Motu Proprio of January 18, 1931, the Holy Father has decreed that the new seal (bulla) which has been chosen after many experiments shall hereafter be attached to all acts emanating from the Apostolic Chancery. The obverse of this seal contains the heads of Sts. Peter and Paul, the two Princes of the Apostles, separated by a processional cross; the reverse contains the name of the reigning Pontiff (PIUS PAPA XI), surmounted by a cross paté (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, XXIII, 33; illustrated, 52).

RELIMITATION OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCES AND DIOCESES OF PRUSSIA

In accordance with the Concordat recently concluded between the Holy See and Prussia, His Holiness has issued an Apostolic Constitution creating the two new ecclesiastical provinces of Breslau and Paderborn (in addition to the existing Province of Cologne), and making some changes in the boundaries of certain of the existing dioceses. A detailed account of these changes will be given in our next issue (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, XXIII, 34).

CREATION OF NEW VICARIATES AND PREFECTURES APOSTOLIC

The new Prefecture Apostolic of Umtata has been created from territory separated from the Vicariate Apostolic of Mariannhill, South Africa (*Acta Apost. Sed.*, XXIII, 41).

The Prefecture of Caquetà, Republic of Colombia, has been raised to a Vicariate Apostolic (*Acta Apost. Sed.*, XXIII., 42).

The boundaries have been defined between the Vicariate Apostolic of the Western District of the Cape of Good Hope and the Prefecture Apostolic of the Central District (*Acta Apost. Sed.*, XXIII, 43).

The Prefecture Apostolic of Matadi in the Belgian Congo has been raised to a Vicariate Apostolic (*Acta Apost. Sed.*, XXIII, 46).

The new Vicariate Apostolic of Hengchow has been erected from territory separated from the territory of Changsha, China (*Acta Apost Sedis*, XXIII, 47).

INTRODUCTION OF THE CAUSE OF JOHN BAPTIST OF ST. MICHAEL THE ARCHANGEL

The Holy Father has designated the Commission for the introduction of the cause of the Servant of God, John Baptist of St. Michael the Archangel, Professed Priest of the Congregation of Discalced Clerics of the Most Holy Cross and Passion (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, XXIII, 53).

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS

The following have been appointed Domestic Prelates to His Holiness: Rt. Rev. Msgri. Leo Nelligan, William Lyons, Michael Joseph O'Gorman, William Burke Carleton (Archdiocese of Edmonton), William Godfrey (Archdiocese of Liverpool, residing at Rome), Michael J. McDonald, James F. Nicholson (Diocese of Kingston), Walter Cavanagh (Archdiocese of Ottawa).

The Grand Cross of the Order of St. Gregory has been conferred upon Messrs. Francis Alexander Anglin and Rudolph Lemieux (Archdiocese of Ottawa). Messrs. Renat Ernest Lefaivre (Archdiocese of Quebec) and Napoleon Anthony Belcourt (Archdiocese of Ottawa) have been made Knights Commanders of the Order of St. Gregory; the following have been made Knights of the Order of St. Gregory: Messrs. Edward Ryan, Charles Edward O'Connor (Archdiocese of Kingston), and John Alfred Kelly (Archdiocese of Liverpool).

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Homiletic Part

Sermon Material for the Month of May

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

The Pledge of the Spirit

By S. ANSELM PARKER, O.S.B., M.A.

"It is expedient for you that I go: for if I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send Him to you" (John, xvi. 7).

SYNOPSIS: The twofold Revelation made at the last Supper.

(1) *Who is the Holy Spirit?*

(2) *What is the meaning of His "Mission"?*

(3) *The Christian's rich inheritance, the pledge of which is the living, personal, indwelling Spirit.*

Exhortation: Devotion to the Holy Ghost.

During this season from Easter to Pentecost, a time of joyful preparation, the Church urges us to ponder constantly a revelation made by Our Lord at the close of His earthly life. And today she reminds us of something very important made known at the Last Supper. A twofold revelation was then made known concerning the Holy Spirit. The Holy Ghost is indeed a Person, like unto Jesus Himself. And also He would be "sent": there would be a new and definite "sending," unknown before.

These are two mysteries far beyond our comprehension. The Holy Spirit is spoken of by Our Lord as the Promise of the Father. His Mission was to be the special fruit of the Incarnation, Redemption and Ascension; so that not until the Sacred Humanity of Jesus was glorified, and until He had returned—now as God-Man, as the Head of the human race—to that glory which was His with the Father before the world was made, could this "sending" of the Holy Ghost to us take place.

We will endeavor, then, to consider once again who is this Holy Spirit, and what do we mean by this "sending" from Heaven, that so we may the more appreciate our rich inheritance, of which the Holy Spirit is the pledge as St. Paul reminds us: "You were

signed with the Holy Spirit of promise, who is the pledge of our inheritance" (Eph., i. 13).

THE PERSON OF THE HOLY GHOST

A fruitful way to help us to understand who the Holy Spirit is, is to consider the scene from which the words of today's Gospel are taken. Let us try to enter into the thoughts, into the misgivings, of our fellow-disciples at the Last Supper. We come to the moment when for the first time anxiety burst upon them, for they realized that Jesus was indeed about to leave them. Endeavor to enter into their emotions. They were filled with sorrow—nay, with consternation. Had they not left all they prized upon this earth, all they had held dear? They had given up all to follow Him. For three years they had been in His constant companionship. They had found in Him their Teacher, their Master, their Father, their only Friend. Always accessible they had found Him, always full of sympathy and understanding, always full of interest in all their personal concerns. "Come to Me," had been His invitation; and following Him had satisfied every human need. But beyond this that invitation was in its character something entirely unique. All other religious teachers received disciples merely to pass them on to God; but Jesus Christ claims to center all in Himself. He claims what no other man has ever pretended to claim. He claims to give to the human soul that full and perfect satisfaction, a claim which is the prerogative of God alone: to be for each one what God alone can be. Indeed, this very claim manifested by Jesus is one of the strongest proofs that He is Divine: "Come ye all to Me." And the disciples had given the fullest response. Their devotedness of heart and mind, their whole affection, was centered in Him. As He had loved them, so they according to their capacity had loved Him and Him alone. It is not difficult, then, for us to enter into their heartfelt sorrow: "No, Master, You must not go; surely You will not leave us." Yet Jesus re-assured them: "I will not leave you orphans. I will send you another Paraclete." But, they lovingly protested, no one else, no other, could possibly take His place. Any such thought was beyond them.

And now we come to the mystery of God's wisdom and love.

"I tell you the truth," Our Lord said with emphasis: "it is expedient for you that I go." We can understand that it would undoubtedly be better in this that the Holy Spirit, sent to abide with us, to be always in us, would overcome those limitations of time and space which were a necessary condition of the incarnate life of Jesus upon earth: at times they must be absent from His Presence, or could not be alone with Him. But there is a much deeper mystery in this revelation concerning the Holy Ghost. It would be expedient in a far higher way. If, then, we trust the assurance of our Divine Lord, we know that some better Presence was to follow, something far transcending the visible personal Presence of Jesus. All that Our Lord has been to the Apostles—nay, more still—would be the privilege inherited by faithful members of His Kingdom, the Church. Had He not pointed to John the Baptist as the greatest born upon earth, and yet declared that the least in the Kingdom was greater than he? This saying had reference to some great privilege that would be given.

THE MISSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

And what was this mission or "sending" of the Holy Spirit to the earth? Our Lord spoke of it as a definite and real fact. In reflecting upon the circumstances of His Coming on the day of Pentecost, we may find certain observable signs: the visible tongues of fire given to each—fire is full of mystery; the mark of the coming—not a gentle breath but something mighty as a tempestuous wind filling the whole house; the astonishing miracle of the gift of tongues; the boldness and enthusiasm, taking the place of timidity and fear and dullness of heart in the disciples; even their rejoicing as they welcomed persecution; finally, the remarkable fruits that attended their evangelization—the miracles, the numerous conversions, the resplendent character of the life of the Early Christians at Jerusalem. Such are some of the outward manifestations brought about by that "sending" of the Holy Spirit. "Send forth Thy Spirit," we pray, "and Thou shalt *renew* the face of the earth." But how shall we speak of the unfathomable mystery? We may help ourselves to realize it by making an analogy. Christians understand that, whilst God is present everywhere from the beginning of cre-

ation, a new and most stupendous fact took place in the Incarnation. The Word was made flesh: God became Man. He came down from heaven and dwelt upon earth amongst the children of men. Henceforth His Presence is of a wholly different and new nature. And He was *sent*: "God so loved the world that He sent His Son." Now, it is not true to speak of the Incarnation of the Holy Spirit. He never took flesh, as Jesus was born of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Yet at a definite moment, on the day of Pentecost, He was sent down from Heaven. He, the Holy Spirit of God, the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, came to abide on earth. Whatever may be said of the wonders of the Holy Spirit from the beginning in the works of creation or of His marvellous operations in the souls of the just, this Pentecostal Presence, to abide henceforth, was new and is as real as the Presence of God the Son since the time of the Incarnation: it was a true coming-down, a true sending by Father and Son. "When the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send from the Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceedeth from the Father, He will give testimony of Me." "I will ask the Father and He will send Him." "It is expedient for you that I go. If I go not, He will not come to you; but if I go, I will send Him."

THE PLEDGE OF THE SPIRIT

The sending of the Holy Spirit is the crown and the fruit of the life-work of the Son of God. He is God's pledge of the fullness of our inheritance. Not only have we the promise of Jesus that He would go to prepare many mansions for us on High, that He would be seated at the right hand of the Father ever to make intercession for us; not only have we the pledge of His love and His own abiding Presence given to the world by the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament; not only have we a covenant full of mercies, the New and Eternal Covenant ratified by the Precious Blood shed in the Sacrifice on Calvary, but moreover, there is a most special pledge or seal bestowed upon each and all of the redeemed. This gift, the gift of the Most High, is not some created thing, not even some most choice blessing; this gift is a Person—a Person "sent," indwelling, another Paraclete who most fully takes the place of the visible Presence of Jesus Himself. His work does not supersede

or replace that of our Blessed Lord. It makes internal what before was external. "If any man keep My word, We will come to him and abide within him." He is the Spirit of Jesus, the Spirit of Christ. This Holy Spirit is God's gift to His Church, the mystical Body of Jesus Christ. It is the inheritance of all those baptized into His name, reborn of water and the Holy Ghost. He is called the Spirit of the adoption of sons; and He gives testimony within us that we are indeed the sons of God. He is the author of the Church's beauty, of its unity, its infallibility, and all its multifarious fruitfulness. There are many souls within the Church, each with individual perfection or capability of perfection and many diverse gifts; but it is the same Spirit who worketh all in all. It is precisely in proportion to our fidelity as members of the Church that we experience His power and His loving help.

Such is the most glorious inheritance of the true Christian. O, that the Vision were always before us, that we appreciated our dignity! The only calamity that can befall us is to "extinguish" or to "quench" this Holy Spirit—such are St. Paul's expressions—by defiling by sin this temple of His which we are. The only folly is to "contristate" or grieve this Spirit of Love, to neglect His indwelling Presence. Would that we relied less on our own efforts, our own strivings, made perhaps earnestly yet with some sense of isolation! Would that all our confidence rested in this Pledge of God's care and interest and personal love! To become holy we have but one work, namely, to seek to please always and in all things this Divine Guest, the Paraclete, throughout our daily lives, to seek His help amidst our trials, our temptations, our weaknesses, to be docile, submissive, and ever-attentive to the whisperings of His counsel and guidance. "Whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, these are the Sons of God." Are we thus led, we may ask ourselves today. At least in this season we may renew our attitude of devotedness to Him, beseeching Him to illuminate our minds that the fire of His love may be enkindled more and more in our hearts. And let us be earnest in preparation, as the Apostles were bid, that we too may be imbued with power from on High, and at Pentecost this year may receive in greater abundance His unction, that so His radiance may show forth in the fruit of our daily lives.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

The Social Value of Prayer

By D. J. MACDONALD, PH.D.

"Amen, amen I say to you, if you ask the Father anything in My name He will give it you" (John, xvi. 23).

SYNOPSIS: Introduction: Nature of prayer.

I. Prayer makes us godlike.

II. Prayer lessens social injustice.

III. Modern social science inadequate.

IV. Other social advantages of prayer.

Conclusion: Necessity of daily prayer.

In the Gospel of today our Divine Saviour teaches us the value of prayer. He tells us that it is so valuable that it will procure for us "anything." It will procure for us spiritual wealth and social wealth, social peace and happiness. Let us consider today this latter phase of the value of prayer, that is, the efficacy of prayer in securing good social conditions. It is desirable for us to know as much as possible about the value of prayer, because the more we realize how valuable prayer is, the greater will be the use that we will make of this treasure.

In its most general sense, prayer is elevation of our minds to God to adore Him. In prayer we acknowledge God's power and sovereignty and our dependence on Him. The more we pray, the more shall we realize what our true place in the universe is, the more shall we act in conformity to the Divine will, the more truth shall we acquire. Prayer is communication with God, and gives us all the advantages that must follow from holding converse with Him.

COMMUNICATION WITH GOD MAKES US GODLIKE

Communication with other human beings makes us in a sense human. It does not make us human in the sense that it gives us a human soul, but it does make us human in the sense that we would not have some of the human qualities that we now possess if we did not come in contact with other human beings. Persons have been brought up in isolation, and they were little better than animals. Without communication with others we would not have sympathy and emulation; without it we would not have our present religion,

language, and other customs. So powerful is the influence of communication that it not only makes us human, but it makes us like the human beings with whom we associate.

Just as communication with human beings makes us human, so communication with God makes us divine. If we come into His presence on the wings of prayer, we shall become like Him. Through association with Him our minds will catch some of His qualities, just as our minds catch the language and ideas of the people with whom we associate. If we isolate ourselves from learned people and other sources of learning, we shall never become learned. So, too, if we isolate ourselves from God and do not come in contact with Him, as manifested to us in philosophy and Revelation, we shall be deprived of a great deal of truth, and consequently our conduct will not be what it should. If we keep in communication with God, if we pray, He will so form our personalities that we shall be wise and good, and society will be sane and safe.

PRAYER LESSENS SOCIAL INJUSTICE

One of the main causes of bad social conditions is injustice and exploitation. A few people get a lot of the world's goods, and many get a little. Many lack the wealth, health, education, and opportunity that they should have. As a consequence further exploitation becomes easy, good natural abilities are not developed, and the whole world suffers.

But why do the few exploit the many? They do so because they do not recognize their dependence on God, because they do not pray. Prayer is recognition of our dependence on God and of His supreme dominion over us. I was created by Him; I am His, and so also are John, Mary and the whole human race. I do not say *My* Father but *Our* Father. Since, then, other persons are the property of God, as it were, I may not deal with these persons as I please. I must act in conformity with the will of the Creator who made us both. Take away this recognition of our dependence on God, take away prayer, and exploitation will become general.

Recognition of our dependence on God is the foundation stone on which alone can be constructed the edifice of social justice. A social system built on any other foundation may have the appearance of a stable edifice, but it will not last long, for it is built on sand.

A social system not based on the recognition of God's dominion over us may dispense justice for a time, but, since the real reason for the existence of justice is not acknowledged, justice itself will soon disappear. Just as mathematics is the foundation of engineering, so recognition of our dependence on God is the foundation of social justice. If mathematics were to disappear, some engineering would be carried on for a time, but eventually modern engineering would become a thing of the past. So, too, if belief in God were to disappear, the social edifice of justice now existing would soon disappear and social life would be the life of the jungle.

MODERN SOCIAL SCIENCE INADEQUATE

The modern sociologist claims that education will so condition people that they will be just and fair. Through modern education right principles of action will be established and the habits of people will be formed according to these principles. Through modern education, it is claimed, people will not want to exploit one another, but will want the welfare of others just as much as their own.

The theory that education alone will make me respect the feelings of others leads to several absurd conclusions. If, as the materialist educationist says, man is a mere animal, why should a human being have more rights than a cow? Reason, they say, tells me that I must be considerate of the welfare of others. But according to reason alone there is no more ground why I should respect the feelings of another person than I should respect the feelings of a cow being brought to a slaughter house. They are both, according to our modern sociologist, mere animals one of which can be conditioned a little more easily than the other. Not many of our sociologists have gone so far as to advocate the rights of cows to old-age pensions, but destroy belief in God and cows will have the same rights as men—the slaughter of both will become more general than it now is in the struggle for existence.

Education can do much to mould human nature, but there is one thing it cannot do, and that is make men respect the rights of others without religion. Destroy religion and the very basis of social justice is destroyed.

OTHER SOCIAL ADVANTAGES OF PRAYER

Many of our physical and mental ills are due to overwork, worry, avarice, jealousy, anger, etc. All these generate poisons in the body that injure our physical health. The man of prayer does not suffer so much from these evils as the worldly man does. To the man of prayer the troubles of this world are stepping stones to higher things. St. Theresa was so satisfied with suffering that she exclaimed: "Let me suffer or let me die." The man of prayer is a more cheerful and safer citizen to live with.

Our prayers keep before our minds the mercy and goodness of God. They keep before us how much Christ values our souls, how much He has done for us, and our great dignity. All this helps us to value properly time and eternity, and to act sanely. All this lessens selfishness, and makes us good citizens.

Prayer makes us interested in one another, makes us coöperate with one another. The best prayer that we make, the Our Father, reminds us that we are all brothers, all children of the one Father. In this prayer, too, we ask God to forgive us as we forgive others. Surely, such a prayer should tend to increase peace in this world of strife.

CONCLUSION

The more we pray, the stronger will be our mental habits of recognizing our dependence on God, and the greater will be the conformity of our actions with the will of God. The more we pray, the more charitable and just shall we be, and the better will society be.

It is not sufficient to pray occasionally. Just as it is not sufficient to wind a watch occasionally in order to keep it going, so it is not sufficient to think occasionally of our dependence on God if we are to do His holy will. Only the person who keeps his high aim continually before him will achieve that aim, and only the person who prays often will be saved. The practice of daily prayer has good psychological warrant. Daily prayer is the best means of individual and social salvation.

SUNDAY WITHIN THE OCTAVE OF THE ASCENSION

Kindness or Charity

By H. B. LOUGHNAN, S.J.

"Before all things, have a constant mutual charity among yourselves; for charity covereth a multitude of sins" (I Peter, iv. 8).

SYNOPSIS: I. The practice of "charity" in the Catholic Church.

II. The characteristics of charity.

III. Some questions that should be frankly faced and answered.

IV. Conclusion.

A BRIEF SURVEY

From her very cradle the Catholic Church has been marked by her care of the poor. In her infant years we hear of organized, personal and painstaking efforts made by those who had to help those who had not. And this thoughtfulness and practical help which sprang from sympathy (one of the most beautiful words in the English language) had nothing of that cold and somewhat self-complacent formalism which has become associated with "charity." Instead, it was kindness. The receiver, the man who was "down," was "carus" or "dear," because in him the man who was blessed with this world's goods saw the person of the Master who loved much, gave much, and got little. Hence it was through "caritas" or kindness that help was given to the sufferer who was "carus" or "dear."

Note further that, though many details are given of those early charitable organizations, hardly a single name stands out blazoned on the page of history as that of one who was princely in his charity. And why is there none such? Because those who gave were not princely, but Christ-like in their giving.

And at a later date, before the seamless robe of Christian unity was gashed by the Reformation and when civilization was the Church and the Church was civilization, we find kindness woven into the very woof of the conscience of her children. Hospitals, refuges and orphanages flourished. They were well equipped by private funds and well staffed by voluntary efforts; and—what would make many a modern young man gasp—there were not a few cases where University students did the servants' work in the morning;

and there were instances where men who did not belong to the institution washed and fed and dressed the sick. And such helpers were not limited to those who have been canonized; they were just normal Catholic lay men or women. State charity was unknown, but the poor were not thereby the losers.

Again, an essential feature of those wonderful Christian institutions which are the envy of the modern non-Christian world—I mean the Trades Guilds—was the provision for the sick and the aged. That this was real “charity enlivened by faith” (if I may reverse the words of a famous text), is borne out by its far-sightedness. For it did not lose interest in the sufferers when time had ended their pain; instead, it followed them into the next world and made generous provision for Masses and for prayers for their souls.

And today the true Catholic layman has the same high ideal of kindness to Christ in the person of the poor. For there are not a few of our best-known doctors who spend their Sundays in giving professional services to the poor that have been discovered by the St. Vincent de Paul Society to need such help. Thus, through genuine charity the professional man visits the poor, without charging a cent, when it would cost you or me a ten-dollar note to see him for ten minutes in his rooms. And the Catholic chemist makes up the prescription and loses nothing by the graciousness of the gift freely given. I mention but a few cases at random; you can recall others—for instance, where the widow or the orphan or the poor man, who has been wronged in a business deal, has the services of a Catholic lawyer to secure that justice is done.

CHARACTERISTICS

Now, please note most carefully the following characteristics of this kindness or charity. For I want you to do a little thinking and then to put to yourselves some plain, blunt questions, and not to balk at them because they are awkward. In the first place, charity of this personal sort was looked upon as a moral obligation; and the clear-cut, definite assertion of St. Peter which I have read for you leaves no doubt on this point. St. John also wonders how a man can say that he loves Christ, if he shows no practical help to Christ's poor.

Secondly, the motive for this charity is twofold. On the one hand, there is an active faith which prevents the giver from being repulsed by uncouthness or uncleanness or by churlish lack of gratitude; for this faith sees Christ in "the least of his little ones." Nor, again, is the giver made hard or cynical by discovering that at times he has been imposed upon; for did not this happen to the Master? And, after all, does Christ measure our love for Himself by the absence of mistakes in the bestowal of sympathy? On the other hand, the giver is urged by the legitimate ambition for holiness, by the desire for an antidote to worldliness, by the yearning to do something for the Master to whom he owes so much.

Thirdly, it was not then true as now that "one-half of the world doesn't know what the other half is doing." And this was a partial but very forcible reason for the absence of class warfare; for the poor did not feel that they were pariahs, and consequently there was not that sullen bitterness rankling in their minds which is noticeable today.

SOME QUESTIONS

Here are a few questions. Face them manfully and answer them. First, how many of you have this Catholic interest in the poor? It is said with a pathetic amount of truth that "it's the poor that help the poor"; and any priest who is welcome in their homes knows how real is this statement. A log of wood or a loaf of bread often passes from one house to another; a sick mother whose wage-earner is away looking for work, is helped by the slender resources of her neighbor. But why should not this redeeming beauty in human nature be found elsewhere? Those of you who are blessed with this world's goods and have not the constant anxiety about finding the necessities of life, have you that interest in others which Christ had? Face St. John's question, and answer it: "He that shall see his brother in need and disregard him, how doth the charity of God abide in him?" (I John, iii.).

Secondly, is it not true that "one-half the world doesn't know what the other half is doing"? You may know the fact that a definite number of people are "below the bread line," but this is not real knowledge unless you appreciate what the facts mean. Can you enter into the feelings of a father or mother, whose children

go hungry to school and are cold at night, and being underfed can offer no resistance to sickness? Do you know what a home is like when the evenings are cheerless and fireless, and prospects of the coming day are bleak? If you had this real knowledge—which is “sympathy” or the “sharing of another’s feelings”—you simply could not be stoical and pass lightly over facts by remarking: “That’s the way the world is made; every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost.” The plain truth is this: you cannot be a genuine Catholic and have no interest in those in whom Christ is interested.

And here is another question: how much do you spend each month on amusements? Take a pencil and figure it out when you go home. “Talkies,” excursions, holidays, candies, tobacco—it’s right of course and fitting that you should have these things in due measure. But how much do they come to? How much is spent in the service of self, and how much in the service of Christ? I know, of course, that the answer will vary considerably. For, on the one hand, there are a large number—a consolingly large number—who do take an interest in all that concerns the Church and the poor; who limit their expenditure on amusements largely to those which are organized for the liquidation of debts on church and schools; who generously support the work of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, even if they cannot find time to share the privilege of active membership. But on the other hand this number, though large, is alarmingly limited to precisely that class who have not much of “the substance of this world,” and who have not a wide margin to spare between receipts and expenditure. And in a most especial way do I urge this question upon those who have the abundance: how much a month is spent on the service of self, and how much on the service of Christ?

CONCLUSION

Let me conclude with some disconnected suggestions. Would you not considerably lessen the bitterness of the poor if these felt that in their case the saying was *not* true: “Out of sight is out of mind”? Again, keep clear of a dangerous modern tendency to direct the spotlight of publicity upon your charity. For while we have the high command, “Let your light shine before men,” we have also

the sobering advice: "Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth." You will agree, I think, that in much of modern charity the command is observed to the full, while the warning is neglected; for, are there not instances where we find names of Catholics figuring in the social columns of the papers as successful workers in the cause of public charity, but we do not find them on the list of active members of the parish society for the poor? Such Catholics are practising what may be called "civic virtue"; and of them Christ's words are true: "They have their reward." But they are not themselves growing richer by the exercise of that humble and sincere kindness which endears the helper to the heart of Christ.

We rightly appreciate bequests to charity; we rely much on them for our work; and we remember the donors in our prayers. Hence, do not take what I am now about to say as in any way depreciating such charitable bequests; I am only suggesting that there are cases where the charity could be improved in its value before God. And my suggestion is this: remember Our Lord's advice to work while you have the light, for "the night cometh when no man may work." Now, there *may be* cases where this reminder would show that it is ill advisable to limit your charity to the leaving of legacies for charitable purposes. For what does this mean? It may be at times construed to mean that, when you have used to the full the goods you possess and when you have no further use for them, a portion is bequeathed to the poor—a posthumous charity which would have been much more appreciated by God, had the gift changed hands before the hands of the giver were gripped by death.

I make a special appeal to those young men who are, as it were, about to climb the social tree of life, and who mix with a class that spends money freely. To these young men I say: step not *down*, but *up*, into the ranks of some organization like the St. Vincent de Paul Society. It will prevent you becoming shallow-minded and worldly; it will win for you the appreciation and respect and love which will console you by its genial warmth (for there is no friendship so dear as is that of the poor); it will gain for you a further treasure that will gladden you in life and will not desert you in death—the personal friendship of Jesus Christ whom you serve in the person of His poor.

PENTECOST SUNDAY

The Effects of the Holy Ghost's Coming

By THOMAS B. CHETWOOD, S.J.

- SYNOPSIS: I. *The mental attitude of the Apostles after Christ's Ascension.*
II. *The effects on the Apostles of the Coming of the Holy Ghost.*
III. *The first lesson of Pentecost.*
IV. *Christ's plan clarified by Pentecost.*
V. *The fullness of Christ's message.*

The morning of the Ascension of Christ into heaven marked the closing of a great drama, the drama of the visible life of Christ on this earth. It had ended very much as it had begun. At both times there were Angels and the music of an Angelic message. At both times it was only the chosen few who were witnesses: the first time a handful of simple shepherds and the second time a handful of Apostles, puzzled and staggering with all the things they knew but could not say. Then there is another striking likeness in the way Christ came and went. At both times the gate of heaven swung open, as it were, for a moment and some of its glory overflowed upon the earth; but it was only for a moment. The strong hand of Christ shut it close once more, and there was left the first time a little Baby indistinguishable in the midst of an ordinary-looking world; the second time there were left a few Apostles looking up at the sky, and all around them was the same bleak, ordinary world.

Let us now consider these Apostles, what they had and what particularly they lacked. In the first place, they were all godly men. No one could look at their honest faces and doubt that. Their conversation, as they footed it slowly homeward, was full of godliness and charity. Moreover, they were Christian men. There was one name often on their lips, the Name of Christ. Tears answered tears as they repeated that Name. Sigh rose upon sigh as they recalled many things that He did. Filled they were to the brimming of their sad hearts with the memory of Christ. All the words He said were present to them, and they told them over lovingly, and they lived through again His sorrows and His triumphs. They could look forward to a whole lifetime of this blessed pondering, and then Heaven would come. They caught each other's hands, and their eyes kindled with blessed anticipation.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE APOSTLES AFTER THE ASCENSION

Then there was present in them the feeling of estrangement from the world about them. There it lay at the foot of the mountain-slope. They shivered as they looked at it and averted their faces from it, as they took their way down the hill path that led back to Jerusalem. When they entered the gate of the city, they muffled their heads and hurried along the way to their dwelling place. How this city buzzed and trembled, not merely with hatred for Christ but with bitter misunderstanding of Him! What could these people about them understand of His teaching? What appreciation did they have for that tender history which these Apostles were rehearsing in their hearts, for that Face which was enshrined in the memory of these His followers? Why, His very name would be greeted with jeers. This was the thought that made them shut the door tight and fasten it when they reached their destination. How much freer they breathed when the world was safely barred out! Perhaps the words of Christ came back to them which were said in this very place: "I pray not for the world." And in their blindness—for sight had not come to them yet—they may have quoted these words to soothe their own isolation: "He did not pray for the world. He could have no part with the world. The world does not understand the things we say nor the very language we speak. We, we, are safe and away from it."

We hear the echo of this spirit often today, and often on good Christian lips. "What my Lord has showed me and given me is enough for me," says the gentle old lady looking up from her Bible. "I will let the world alone. It does not understand and it never can." Then this peaceful gospel takes another form even more commonly in these days and in our own country. "Trouble no man in his faith or his unfaith. One sincere creed is as good as another. Live and let live."

THE EFFECT OF THE COMING ON THE APOSTLES

Suppose those men long ago, called by the warrior name of Apostle, suppose they had settled down in this supine gospel of peace. Suppose they had solaced themselves with the thought: "One sincere creed is as good as another." Then the message of Christ

would have died in the hearts of a few timid, simple men and women in a corner of the world. But it did not die, that message—God knows it did not die. “For there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty wind coming. And it filled the whole house where they were sitting and there appeared to them parted tongues, as it were of fire, and it sat upon every one of them and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak. . . .” Where did they begin to speak? Across the table each to each and in tones that were solemn and low, that were only for the elect to hear? See them unlock the door and fling it wide open. They will hardly have use for a house any more, at least for any long time. For the blue sky shall be the tent for these conquerors of the world—but that because the heart of the world was closed to Him. “But I will open that world’s heart,” cried out every one of these terrible men as they set to take the world in the flank. “I will burst open the world’s heart. I will storm it. I will capture it. I will fill it with the message of Christ.” But the world will not understand their message? It will, it must. By His power for whom they speak they will force their way into every understanding. And lo! “every man hears them speak in his own tongue.”

The world blinked stupidly like a person aroused from sleep. Short will be the poor world’s untroubled sleep because of the lashing voices of these men from now on. “They are drunk,” it cried. And they were—inebriate with the poured out wine of the Spirit, mad with the fury of the wind that resteth not. And what was this fury, this madness, that filled these erstwhile peaceful men? It was not something incoherent. It was a clear and distinct message, so clear that no one could misunderstand it, so brief that no one could close his ears to it; for before one refused it entrance, behold it was entered in and was wrestling with one’s uneasy heart. The message was about Christ. But it was not merely: “Think of Christ who died for you”; but rather: “Behold! here is Christ living for you.” It was not merely: “Consider these things that Christ has taught”; but: “Listen! Here is Christ teaching.” “Being exalted therefore by the right hand of God,” cried the fearless Peter, “and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath poured forth this which you see and hear.”

THE FIRST LESSON OF PENTECOST

This is the first meaning of Pentecost. It is the spirit of zeal that is the fullness of the legacy of Christ. His message is not like a home-song to be breathed low in the shelter of the fire-side. It is a battle cry to be flung out for all to hear—all without a single exception. Is this world a strange and unfriendly place? Yes, but only because its corners have not yet been kindled by that message. And it is my duty, according to my degree and calling, to spread that message. Is there any nation or quarter of the earth that Christ did not die for, that His searching, longing gaze did not hunger towards, does not hunger for now? If there is, then it is not for us to be concerned about it and the men and women there. But if all over the hills and valleys, in the great places and the small everywhere, are the souls that He longs for, that His Spirit reaches towards, then I can turn away from no corner of the whole wide world.

“If there is anything I hate, it is intruding the subject of religion into social life. Here we all are the children of the same great Father making our way towards Him by different ways, perhaps, but with the same termination for all our paths. Let every one worship God in private according to his lights, and let everyone else alone.” This gospel cannot stand with the turmoil and overturning of Pentecost. If you live it, then you are false to the particular grace that came to you with the laying on of hands in Confirmation. Oh yes, we must be discreet and quietly wise with “the wisdom of the serpent.” But an indiscreet zeal is immeasurably better than no zeal at all. For no zeal at all means that the faith within us does not burn. It is not the fire that Christ came to cast upon the earth, and that burned on the brows of the Apostles at Pentecost.

Christ came on earth to die for men, for *all* men that were before He came, that were contemporary with Him, or that would be until the last man on earth was born. The benefits of His death, the great strong river of His saving blood, overflowed all time. In like manner He came with a message for all men, but His message did not reach back and forth into time in the same way. The men who lived before Him could receive only fragments of His message, like Abraham who rejoiced to see His day in vision or in prophecy. But

out to the men who came after Him His message was sent. Whole and entire it was sent, and not by the carriage of Angels, not on a sacred page, but living and warm articulate on the lips of a body of teachers. Their number was not fixed or limited, but the message was limited for all time. It was given full in the beginning. It could become plainer to individual learners, as it becomes plainer to you and me. It could become plainer to individual teachers, and the need for speaking portions of it more plainly, for finding more exact formulas for it, could arise from age to age. But the one message, the whole message, was delivered to the original teachers and it could never grow more nor grow less.

TRINITY SUNDAY

Our Share in the Life of the Blessed Trinity

By LAMBERT NOLLE, O.S.B.

"Going, therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. (Matt., xxviii. 19).

SYNOPSIS: Introduction: Trinity Sunday is a summary of the great feasts of the year, and invites us to consider the effects of their great mysteries on our souls.

- I. Sanctifying grace is our share in the life of the Father.*
- II. Faith is our share in the life of God the Son.*
- III. Charity is our share in the life of the Holy Ghost.*

Conclusion: Hope is the supernatural force striving forward to the perfection of grace, faith and charity.

The Feast of the Most Holy Trinity which we keep today is, as it were, a summary of the great feasts which we have celebrated. Christmas brought before our minds the eternal and almighty Father and Creator having a Son born of Him from all eternity, whom He sent into this world as man for our salvation. At Easter we beheld the Son of God, the Eternal Wisdom, who by His wisdom overcame the wiles of Satan and by His resurrection conquered sin and death and hell. Whitsunday showed to us the Holy Ghost, who by the flames of divine charity enlightened the minds of the five thousand converts, melted and cleansed their hearts by penance, and by His gift of charity joined them on as living members to the newly manifested Church of God. Today we are invited to consider the effects of all these wonderful deeds of the Blessed Trinity

on our souls. The words of the Holy Gospel today make us realize that these effects began with our baptism, and so it will be easy and fruitful for us to trace the work of the Three Divine Persons in us back to that origin. We have been baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Now, it is true that the Three Divine Persons are also mentioned in the administration of other holy Sacraments; but there is this difference, that in baptism they are so essential that this holy Sacrament would be null and void if the three Holy Names were not explicitly mentioned. Why is this? Because this first and most necessary Sacrament places us in a special relationship with each Divine Person, and makes us in the highest sense partakers of the personal life of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost.

SANCTIFYING GRACE, OUR SHARE IN THE LIFE OF THE FATHER

The Father, as our Blessed Lord teaches us, John, v. 26, "has life in Himself," and also from Himself, and even the Son lives by the Father. No one can have that life by nature except a Divine Person; even the holy Angels, who now share eternal life with God, received it as a gift, which they preserved whilst the faithless spirits lost it when they revolted. Our first parents had it too, but lost it for themselves and for us. The consequence is as St. Paul says (Eph., ii. 3) that "by nature we were children of wrath." How did it come then that St. Paul (Rom., i. 7) and St. Jude (i. 1) could address the faithful as beloved of God? Because they had become, and therefore could be "named children of God" (I John, i. 3); and this because as St. John says (i. 13): "They were born of God." Have *we* any claim to this name and title? Are we born of God? Yes, because we have received baptism; in it we have been "born again of water and the Holy Ghost" (John, iii. 5), and thereby we have received a new life which entitles us to "enter the kingdom of heaven," and to share the inheritance of the children of God. That new life is sanctifying grace, which, as St. Paul teaches us (Rom., vi. 23), is already "life eternal," and which, as the Prince of the Apostle (II Pet., i. 4) tells us, will make us "partakers of the divine nature," that is, sharers of the life of the Father, as far as this is possible for mere creatures, and as it is already realized in the Angels of God. This grace drives away from the soul the dark-

ness and death of sin in which we sit by nature, and makes us children of the light of God Himself. For the sake of this living image of God's own life in us the Father loves us, not indeed in the same degree as He loves His only begotten Son but for the same reason. And because by holy baptism we became children of God, we are allowed to speak to God as "Our Father," and to address Him with childlike simplicity and confidence. But, as we are only made babes by baptism, the Heavenly Father expects that we shall grow and develop in us that Divine life. For this reason Christ has given us the holy Sacraments as means for increasing sanctifying grace; and it is especially by the Holy Eucharist that that life is strengthened and increased, for Our Lord says (John, vi. 58): "As I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me, the same shall live by Me," that is to say, Christ, who is in the highest degree the partaker of the Father's life, will increase it by His sacramental presence in our souls, so that we shall live the life of the Father in a fuller measure. To the striving after the perfection of this life of sanctifying grace we are exhorted by Our Lord's words: "Be ye therefore perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect."

FAITH, OUR SHARE IN THE LIFE OF GOD THE SON

Together with sanctifying grace we receive in baptism also the gift of faith. Faith gives to us the supernatural capacity of knowing God and His mysteries, "for by faith we have access to the mystery which hath been hidden from eternity in God" (Eph., iii. 12, 9). By this supernatural knowledge which comes to us by faith we share in the life of God the Son, who is the eternal wisdom of God; so much so that He is the only one who can communicate it to others, just as the Father is the principle of all life. For this reason St. John says (i. 18): "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." And again (i. 9): "He enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world." Therefore, the more perfect our knowledge of divine things becomes by faith, the more we share the personal life of the Son of God. This knowledge grows with the help of actual grace by practice, that is, by a life guided by the principles of faith, by spiritual reading and meditation, by attending divine service, and by frequent acts of faith. St. Paul, who knew the importance of

this living faith, prayed for his beloved Colossians (i. 9, 10) that "they might be filled with the knowledge of God's will, in all wisdom and understanding; . . . and increasing in the knowledge of God." And the Prince of the Apostles (II Pet., iii. 18), whilst warning his flock against those who "wrest the scriptures to their own destruction," does not discourage a better knowledge of divine things; for in the last verse which he wrote before his martyrdom he says: "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." But let us not forget that this greater knowledge can in this life never be more than a limited participation of the living knowledge of Christ, and a development of the faith given to us in Holy Baptism. It will become complete only by the vision of God in heaven.

CHARITY, OUR SHARE IN THE LIFE OF THE HOLY GHOST

As the Son is the eternal knowledge of God, so the Holy Ghost is God's eternal charity. And just as Christ is for us the source and origin of our knowledge of God, so the Holy Spirit has poured out in our hearts the charity of God (Rom., v. 5). The Holy Ghost gave to us this most precious of all the gifts of God in Holy Baptism, so that we should be able to partake also in His own personal life. This gift is not like a dead jewel, but it is the most vital force. It changed the face of the world by making the faithful one heart and one soul (Acts, iv. 32); and by implanting Christian self-denial and virtue where before only selfishness and vice had reigned, it supplanted the spirit of cowardly fear and gave power and boldness and perseverance in the service of God (II Tim., i. 7, 8). Yet, with all its power this gift of charity enabled the children of God to labor not only strenuously and bravely, but also with much patience, with sweetness and loving sincerity (II Cor., vi. 4, 6). If we wish to share as we ought in the life of the Holy Ghost and to make it daily more perfect, our charity must be active in the service of God and man and it must also be characterized by the same interior strength and outward moderation as is the action of the Holy Ghost Himself, or as it appeared in the Saints of God, who were strict with themselves but merciful towards others.

CONCLUSION

When we realize that we share the life of the Blessed Trinity by sanctifying grace, by faith and charity, we may fairly ask ourselves: "What is the function of hope, which also is infused in holy baptism?" Hope is that vital supernatural force striving forward in spite of obstacles, towards the perfection of grace and faith and charity. It relies on the powerful Life of the Father, the Wisdom of the Son and the Love of the Holy Ghost. It makes us realize that, on the one hand, the full possession of the eternal inheritance, the vision of God and the inseparable union with Him, is promised to us; but, on the other hand, that this inheritance may still be lost. Therefore, hope will make us both careful so as to prevent that loss, and also active so as to make our eternal happiness more secure. St. John shows this relation of Hope to the supernatural life in heaven when he says (I John, i. 2, 3): "Dearly beloved, we are now the sons of God; and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. We know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like to Him: because we shall see Him as He is. And every one that hath this hope in Him, sanctifieth himself, as He also is holy." The Sundays after Pentecost which are celebrated in green vestments, the color of hope, are dedicated to the worship of the Blessed Trinity. They are a reminder of our duty to imitate and to perfect in ourselves the life of the Blessed Trinity. Our hope gives us the assurance that by the grace of God we shall be able to please the Father by imitating the knowledge and obedience of the Son and the charity of the Holy Ghost, as St. Paul puts it: (Col., i, 10): "That you may walk worthy of God, in all things pleasing; being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God." May this be granted to us by the power of the Father, the wisdom of the Son, and the charity of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Book Reviews

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

The Mass is the great act of Christian worship, renewing from day to day the Sacrifice of the Cross, while the Sacrament of the Eucharist makes Christ present in all our tabernacles and gives Him to the faithful as their spiritual nourishment for earth's pilgrimage. There cannot be too much study or devotion rendered to this central mystery of religion: "Quantum potes tantum lauda, quia major omni laude, nec laudare sufficis." We should welcome, therefore, four new books devoted to the elucidation of the Eucharist, their aim being the increase of our piety towards the Blessed Sacrament and of our spiritual benefit from it. Fr. Husslein's work¹ is a history of the Mass, chiefly in the early Church. Starting with the first Mass celebrated by Christ at the Last Supper and the Breaking of Bread at Emmaus, the author then goes on to describe the Holy Sacrifice as it was offered in the days of the Apostles, and concludes with a study of Mass as said in early Patristic times and of the origin of the various Eucharistic liturgies. This scholarly work impresses on the reader the antiquity of the Mass and makes him realize more strongly its identity with the sacrifice that has come down without interruption from Christ Himself. The next book, that of Dr. Busch,² is a worthy contribution to liturgical literature, presenting as it does a brief and clear outline of the Mass as a structural unity. Dr. Miller's work³ is expository, and sets forth in language as simple as the subject matter permits the dogmatic arguments for the sacrificial character of the Mass and the doctrinal decisions of the Church on the offerer of Mass, the ends for which it is offered, and the fruits it produces. The errors which the Council of Trent rejected are also noted, and a special chapter deals with the theories and speculations of theologians on the essence of the Mass. The fourth of the books before us is more directly devotional than the others.⁴ It considers the importance of the Eucharist for man's spiritual life and salvation, and brings out this thought very strikingly in three different sections. First the author shows, from the nature of the Sacrament itself and from Christ's own

¹ *The Mass of the Apostles. The Eucharist: Its Nature, Earliest History and Present Application.* By Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D. (P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York City).

² *The Mass Drama. An Outline of Its Structure.* By William Busch, Professor of Church History in the St. Paul Seminary (The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minn.).

³ *The Eucharistic Sacrifice.* By Rev. B. V. Miller, Ph.D., D.D., Late Professor of Dogmatic Theology at St. Mary's College, Oscott (The Macmillan Co., New York City).

⁴ *A Commentary on the Cult of the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar.* By Rev. Myron Zalitch (P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York City).

words about it as well as from tradition and the Church's teaching, that the Eucharist holds a preëminent place among the Sacraments; next he examines the peculiar needs of childhood, youth, maturity and old age, and indicates how well suited is Holy Communion for all of these needs; finally he draws on the history of the Church from the beginning down to the present time to point out the special benefits which Holy Communion has conferred on the Church as a whole from century to century.

J. A. McHUGH, O.P.

PREACHERS AND SERMONS

Some nine years ago a Nonconformist preacher entered the Catholic Church after a religious pilgrimage marked by more than one detour. He now writes a most enjoyable series of "Impressions of a Pilgrim,"¹ deserving of much ampler notice than the present reviewer can now give it, since out of the wide range of the chapters only the one which deals with "Eloquence in the Pulpit" (together with some scattering references to sermons in other chapters) may be considered here. He names and crisply characterizes many speakers whom he had heard, secular as well as religious and of several denominations, and, having had himself a special interest in oratory, estimates with a just enthusiasm the real power of eloquence in the pulpit, whilst pointing out the spiritual dangers confronting a pulpit orator who has become popular. But some of the scattering allusions to preaching are of special interest: "The certainty that I must become a Catholic came to me in the late hours of Sunday, May 29, 1921. Curiously enough, I had preached that morning on 'Anxiety'; and in the evening on 'Decision.' My subjects were always selected more than a week before they were delivered, and advertised during the previous week. I could have had no idea of their personal pertinence when selecting them. Without knowing it, I was standing in a Protestant pulpit for the last time on that memorable evening, preaching from the text: 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.' The following day was spent in the painful task of writing letters of explanation to churches which had invited me to preach" (p. 196). A Presbyterian minister had advised him to read Newman "for style in preaching and writing" (p. 157). The first sermon thus read was Newman's famous sermon on "The Second Spring" (p. 158). Twenty years later he read it again as a Catholic, and in the same Arundel Park that was the scene of the first reading. He again pays tribute to its marvellous beauty (p. 259). Again: "Having preached and lectured for nearly twenty years, it is strange to have no pulpit now, when, as a Catholic, I have a *whole* revelation, which in those years I had but in

¹ *Impressions of a Pilgrim*. By A. J. Francis Stanton, author of "Catholic Mysticism" (P. J. Kenedy and Sons).

part" (p. 267). Perhaps he is unconsciously illustrating this contrast when he says: "The average Nonconformist congregation will attend one church rather than another, not because of a principle, but because of a preacher" (p. 272); and: "There is no saying what a Sunday may bring forth in the course of a sermon, if there is a change of preachers" (p. 273). Meanwhile, with the just outlook of a Catholic convert, he discriminates thoroughly between the good people he had served and the poor theology they held. The clerical reader will find the volume both delightful and (because of its knowledge of both sides) helpful; but it could prove especially serviceable to prospective converts.

Father Whalen, O.S.A., gives us a volume of seventy-two sermons intended for delivery at High Mass or the Principal Mass.² With the exception of some panegyrics, they are designed to be of equal length and to take only twenty minutes in delivery. Every Sunday, holyday, and principal feast of the year can be thus covered in sermons that "explain some important lesson contained in the Gospel or Epistle of the day," impressed by appropriate Scriptural quotations. A feature of peculiar interest is the desirable attention given to Sts. Monica, Augustine and Rita.

Father Skelly, O.P., places under the appropriate title of "Jesus and Mary"³ forty-three sermons preached on various occasions but now arranged with beautiful consecutiveness under this title. Especially interesting features are: (a) the inclusion of sermonettes on the Seven Last Words, and (b) an alphabetical Index of matters treated.

Father O'Reilly, S.J., presents "Thoughts for Catholics and non-Catholics" in twenty titles, in his volume entitled "The Light Divine in Parable and Allegory."⁴ In a Foreword, Bishop Armstrong praises the missionary zeal of the author, and justly observes that the reader can hear how from within the covers of this book the voice of the eloquent preacher goes forth. Although it is in form a book of pious reading, it is in reality a storehouse of thoughts for sermons on the Parables, as indeed the dozen learned volumes noticed in the Bibliography might well suggest. The book has several full-page pictorial illustrations.

Father Hagganey, S.J., continues his Meditations on the First Gospel for the use of priests and religious, in the present third volume.⁵ The reviewer has already called attention to the excellence of this exploration of St. Matthew's Gospel for purposes of meditation, and has

² *Sermons for the High Mass or the Principal Mass for Every Sunday, Holy Day and Important Festival of the Year.* By Rev. John A. Whelan, O.S.A. (Frederick Pustet, New York City).

³ *Jesus and Mary: Being a Series of Sermons Preached on Various Occasions.* By the Rev. A. M. Skelly, O.P. (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

⁴ *The Light Divine in Parable and Allegory.* By Patrick J. O'Reilly, S.J. (Loyola University Press, Chicago, Ill.)

⁵ *The Savior as Saint Matthew Saw Him.* By the Rev. Francis J. Hagganey, S.J. Volume III: *Israel's Response to Christ's Invitation* (B. Herder Book Co.).

pointed out its great value for giving the preacher a full background for the liturgical pericopes taken from that Gospel. The present twenty-six Meditations carry us forward from ix. 36 to xii. 45.

Father Berghoff^o meets a demand for sermons about Christ based on other than the oft-repeated Sunday Gospels.

H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

■ *Ein Gang durchs Evangelium: Fünfzig nichtperikopische Sonntagspredigten über Christus.* By Stephan Berghoff (B. Herder Book Co.).

ADOLESCENCE AND AGE

Adolescence is a period of vital importance in which very frequently the destiny of a man is decided. In this crucial age the young man needs guidance of the right kind if his whole future is not to be blighted. At the same time it is well to realize that it is not always easy to play mentor to youth. The task is one that calls for psychological penetration, sympathy and patience. Especially is it difficult to find the right note in speaking to the growing generation. Otherwise good speakers very often fail to make contact with the youthful mind. Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., has undertaken the difficult work of addressing the young and offering them useful advice for the orientation of their lives.¹ He is quite aware of the difficulties that beset his path. It is not small praise to say that he has succeeded moderately well, for in such a difficult undertaking even a scant measure of success is worth while. Many of his talks will go straight to the heart of the young for whom they are intended; others, though quite excellent in themselves and useful for a variety of purposes, are but inadequately attuned to adolescent mentality and, as far as the young are concerned, will fail to bring home their message. For all that, the book contains excellent material, which with some slight reshaping may be rendered very effective.

A generation that restlessly presses on towards new experiences and insists on making its own mistakes, little appreciates the pleasures of memory and the lessons to be gathered from the past. It tries to prolong youth beyond its legitimate time and to encroach on the rightful domain of old age. With dread it considers the days when it is no longer possible to follow the ways of youth, when sedateness and calm become an imperative necessity. Such a generation must again be taught the true meaning of old age, and made acquainted with its charms and rich compensations.

And here is a writer who finds exquisite delight in the closing days of his life, and knows nothing of the gloom that is supposed to en-

¹*The Space of Life Between.* By Fr. Bede Jarrett, O.P. (The Macmillan Company, New York City).

shroud the evening of life.² His memory unfolds before his eyes a fascinating and colorful panorama that has all the vividness of actuality and makes him completely forget the inevitable infirmities that come with the declining years. What old age offers him is so rich that for him there is no decline, no descent, but progress and ascent. Rarely have the beauty and grandeur of old age been described more glowingly. This is a book that brings a much-needed message to those who can see in old age only barrenness and who fear its chilling approach.

Besides this consoling message Msgr. Baunard has much mellow and mature wisdom to offer. He has taken part in the intellectual battles of his time, and speaks of them entertainingly and instructively. He has seen systems come and go. He has witnessed the collapse of many a scientific theory that boastfully threatened to sap the foundations of faith. Clearer than ever he now realizes that faith is the only light that does not fail. Though he perceives the faults of the present age, he is not a harsh censor but shows a sympathetic understanding for human frailties. Of the translation it need only be said that it has been done by a master.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

²*The Evening of life (Compensations of Old Age)*. Translated and Condensed from the Original French of Monsignor Baunard by John L. Stoddard (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wis.).

A CONVERT'S TESTIMONY

Whenever a distinguished convert enters the Catholic Church, his former coreligionists and critics ascribe his conversion to some mental aberration or religious frenzy, and freely prophesy that, when the first fervor subsides, he will forsake the new cult and return to his former religious status, irritated by the tyranny of Rome and disgusted by the ignorance and inertia of its followers. When, after forty years' wavering in the mazes of Congregationalism, Presbyterianism and Universalism and bewildered by the fantastic proposals and eccentric philosophy of Owen, St. Simon, Cousin, Hegel and Kant, Orestes A. Brownson submitted to the Catholic Church, it was regarded as another religious vagary on his part, a prelude to future rationalism and utter infidelity. John Henry Newman's conversion was another surprise to non-Catholics. Few could believe that the brilliant Oxford scholar and religious genius was sincere, and many daily expected his recantation and return to Anglicanism. Yet both Brownson and Newman persevered to the end, laboring to propagate the Church's tenets and defending its teachings with voice and pen.

When John L. Stoddard entered the Church twelve years ago, many freely predicted his stay would be short, as the distinguished lecturer and traveller would soon tire of the irksome fetters of Catholicism,

and would return to the manly freedom of the reforming sects or possibly drift into atheism or indifference. Mr. Stoddard's latest work¹ is a partial answer to those who anticipated his disillusionment after his first fervor. In the Preface he sums up his present position: "I desire to reaffirm and justify my continued and even augmented belief in those fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion, which are now so savagely denied and doubted: and I affirm the absence in my heart of even the shadow of a regret for my conversion." In the first ten chapters, he covers the ground travelled in his first book, "Rebuilding a Lost Faith," affirming his entire and sincere belief in the teachings of the Church. In addition, he has considered various incidents which have taken place since its publication. In his scholarly way he enumerates proof after proof until he covers many doctrinal subjects, although the volume is too limited to embrace the entire field. He bears eloquent testimony to the Divinity of Christ, the credibility of His miracles, the authenticity of the Gospels, the Teaching Church, and other important truths assailed so bitterly today by the enemies of Catholicism and all revealed religion. The last chapter, "From My Portfolio," is perhaps the most instructive and inspiring in the book. From his correspondence with his old friends, all of whom have passed away, he has culled the choicest gems and composed a symposium, a spiritual dialogue, "in the hope that they may seem to others as suggestive as they do to me." To the distraught soul, seeking God's grace, these rare thoughts should prove illuminating and inspiring, dissipating the gloom of doubt and leading the wanderer to the Church of God.

Like "Rebuilding a Lost Faith," the present work is written in elegant but simple diction, and the proofs are so clearly and methodically marshalled that even the humblest reader may follow their logic. It is adapted for all classes and should be welcomed by clergy and laity alike. The former volume has been most helpful for priests in instructing converts, and the new work should prove an equally valuable adjunct in winning souls to the Church of Christ.

THOMAS P. PHELAN, LL.D.

¹ *Twelve Years in the Catholic Church.* By John L. Stoddard (P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York City).

TOWARDS BETTER UNDERSTANDING

Though there may still be room for improvement, on the whole it can be said that a better tone prevails in the religious discussion of our days. The bitterness seems to have gone out of controversy and yielded to a spirit of good will and genuine tolerance. To be sure, this cannot be put down as net gain, for in a measure it is due to a certain indiffer-

ence with regard to fundamental questions. Withal, the change is for the better.

As a really fine example of fairness in religious controversy a work recently published by a Franciscan Father ought to be mentioned.¹ It is what it claims to be—dispassionate and irenic. The points of difference between Catholic and Protestant teaching are set forth calmly and judiciously without any undue show of feeling. In spite of this absence of passion the argument loses none of its strength, and the truth of Catholic doctrine stands forth in bold relief.

The second work illustrating the better spirit is the joint product of five Catholic and five non-Catholic writers.² The first group—consisting of Hilaire Belloc, Archbishop Goodier, S.J., Sheila Kaye-Smith, Ronald Knox and C. C. Martindale, S.J.—give their reasons for their acceptance of the Catholic Faith, whilst the second group—made up of Professor A. E. Taylor, the Bishop of Gloucester, Professor H. L. Goudge, the Rev. W. E. Orchard, and Principal J. W. Oman—state why they reject Catholicism. It is hard to say whether a symposium of this type will assist the honest inquirer in finding the truth, or whether it will rather confirm him in the position from which he started. There is no attempt made at joining the issues, each writer merely setting forth his own views. A pleasing feature is the personal touch that gives to old arguments a novel twist.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

¹*Katholisch und Protestantisch. Eine leidenschaftslose Klarstellung.* Von P. Heribert Holzapfel, O.F.M., S.T.D. (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

²*Why I Am and Why I Am Not a Catholic.* By Five Good Catholics and Five Good Protestants (The Macmillan Company, New York City).

ELIZABETH AND THE PERVERSION OF ENGLAND

In 1558 John Knox, the renegade priest who plunged Scotland into heresy, published a coarse polemic, "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women," directed against Mary Tudor, Mary of Guise, Catherine de Medici and Mary Stuart, all at least nominal Catholic rulers. Mary Tudor died, Mary Stuart lost her throne, and Elizabeth became Queen of England. Although the pamphlet referred to Catholic queens or regents, Elizabeth took umbrage at the frank attacks of the Scottish reformer, and resented his strictures as reflecting on her own conduct and character. Indeed, many of his charges were more applicable to her than to the others, as is evident from a single excerpt: "The monstrous empire of a cruel woman we know to be the only occasion of all those miseries." In his "Life of Knox" Andrew Lang says: "Naturally, this skirl on the trumpet made Knox odious to Elizabeth." In the latest addition to the literature deal-

ing with Elizabeth, Christopher Hollis has borrowed the title from the work by Knox.¹

During the last few years, historians have divested Elizabeth of the halo of glory placed on her brow by the post-Reformation writers, and revealed her in her true colors, cruel, grasping, irreligious, mendacious, and bloodthirsty, while vacillating and cowardly under the masterful cunning of Cecil and his son. Even Lytton Strachey, in "Elizabeth and Essex," with all his biographical wizardry and picturesque limning, was unable to restore her besmirched reputation, and Katherine Anthony in "Queen Elizabeth" was equally unsuccessful. Christopher Hollis has unearthed some new material and drawn some new conclusions which have excited caustic criticism from non-Catholic historians. One reviewer in a metropolitan newspaper notes the absence of the *Imprimatur* as proof that his statements lack the approbation of the Church and are only private opinions. Yet, the author has followed closely the findings and conclusions of the best-known historians of modern times—Herr Meyer's "England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth," Froude's "History of England," and Macaulay's "Essays." Of all these non-Catholics, none was disposed to defend her, while Froude was unable to pay her a simple compliment unless acidulated with scorn. Hollis has likewise drawn largely from the best Catholic writers, Lingard, Gasquet, Belloc, Birt and Camm. Every research into Elizabethan records unearths so much material detrimental to the "Good Queen Bess" that, even if the author may perhaps have erred at times by excess in his zeal for truth, the official papers and documents of the period seem to corroborate even the most extravagant charges.

Most authors maintain that at the accession of Elizabeth the Catholic population numbered from one-half to two-thirds of the total population. It is still a mooted question why Catholicism declined so rapidly and Anglicanism waxed so strong during the forty-five years of her reign. Many Catholic authorities—even prelates of the Church whose opinions must be respected—assert that Catholics were robbed of their faith. On the other hand, their opponents argue that the Church was so corrupt, so dominated by politics, so enslaved by foreign ecclesiastics, that the Englishman's love of religion and loyalty made the religious changes inevitable. The author enumerates the causes usually assigned for the great spiritual upheaval—the Great Schism of the West, the papal exile at Avignon, the paganism of the Renaissance, the War of the Roses, Henry's lust for Ann Boleyn, the sordid greed of the sharers in monastic plunder. Yet, he continues "there was plenty of anti-clericalism (most of it combined with inherited belief in Catholic church doctrines), the beginnings of scepticism which had come in with

¹ *The Monstrous Regiment of Women*. By Christopher Hollis (Minton, Balch & Co., New York City).

the Renaissance, and hardly any heresy. . . . There was also much genuine piety." He sums up the whole controversy in a few words: "The half-truth that the English are more tolerant than other people must be balanced by the equally important half-truth that they are much less willing to be persecuted. There has never been much persecution in England because there have never been many people to be persecuted, because, that is, there have never been people willing to profess a persecuted religion."

The author is eminently fair in his treatment, not prejudiced by religious bias, not glossing over Catholic persecutions and political blunders, condemning Mary Tudor for burning "the poor and ignorant fanatics," while the arch-villains like Cecil were allowed to make an insincere recantation, only to appear in the next reign as religious Frankensteins. He has condemned Elizabeth and justly so, for the great queen of the earlier centuries no longer exists; she has lost her former glamor and appears in her true character. The book is well written, in pleasing diction, and even the most modest scholar may read it with pleasure and profit.

THOMAS P. PHELAN, LL.D.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART

In "Illustrious Friends of the Sacred Heart,"¹ Father Karl Richstaetter, S.J., traces the revelation of His Sacred Heart by Our Redeemer from the first budding of the devotion, through eclipse, to full flowering. He first answers the question, "When did men first pray to the Sacred Heart?" and then answers the second: "Why so late as the twelfth century?" He divides his work into: The First Period (150-1150); The Dawn in Germany (1150-1250); The Third Period among the Franciscan, Dominican and Cistercian Mystics; The Last Period of Ripening and Propagation among the Carthusians; The Work of Reform among Augustinians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Benedictines, Recluses, and so to St. Margaret Mary. Within this framework he traces the development of doctrine according to this thesis, that only in quiet seasons of prayer—not in the infant days of the Church, nor in the age of the Martyrs, or of the Fathers, or of the missions—could the soul find its way to the Wounded Heart. Thus, Christ speaks once of His Heart; St. John speaks of its tenderness and St. Paul of its burning love, but neither mention the word. After that figures of the Good Shepherd abound, but not of the criminal crucifixion. Then Justin Martyr, Origen, St. Augustine, and St. Paulinus of Nola mention Christ's Heart, but the concept disappears before Christ, the glorious King. No Greek or Latin Father

¹ Translated from the Author's Abridgement by Margaret E. Merriman (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

ever saw a crucifix, and when the Body was put on the Cross it was Christ Triumphant. A poem of the newly converted Germans speaks of the Gentle Heart, but not till the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 and until men think more of the Saviour's Passion is dawn at hand.

The author proves from medieval manuscripts and printed documents that the knowledge and worship of the Divine Heart was more widespread in the Middle Ages than heretofore realized. But by the time of Margaret Mary's death in 1691 there were barely a dozen names associated with it outside of England and of Germany (which teems with the cult). It was long before St. Margaret Mary's devotion was recognized by France, still longer before the Universal Church acknowledged it. The Saint indeed gave nothing new to the world, for the idea of reparation had been dear for ages to many. But hers was the first devotion to be not purely personal but solemnly recognized as the common property of the Church.

This is a very interesting book, with edifying examples of devotion strangely like our own from nearly 200 sources. It should bring more understanding and fervor to the devotion.

JOHN K. SHARP.

A CATHOLIC DICTIONARY

Our last issue contained a review of a new work of reference entitled "The Catholic Encyclopædic Dictionary," published by the Macmillan Company. To obviate all possibility of this one-volume work being confused with "The Catholic Encyclopedia" (in sixteen volumes), or with "The New Catholic Dictionary" (published under the same auspices), the Macmillan Company announces that, as soon as its present stock of bound copies of "The Catholic Encyclopædic Dictionary" is exhausted, the title of this work will be changed to "A Catholic Dictionary."

The Homiletic and Pastoral Review

Vol. XXXI

MAY, 1931

No. 8

PASTORALIA

Some Practical Points on Apologetics

Since, as has been insisted on time and again, conversion is not a purely intellectual process, no one can be reasoned into the Faith. Dialectics, though necessary, is nevertheless inadequate. The vital spark that flames into belief is not kindled by a logical demonstration, however convincing and compelling it may be from the intellectual point of view. This fact thoroughly realized will prevent us from overestimating the importance and function of apologetics. Apologetics must not receive too large a measure of attention, nor be allowed to bulk too large in the ministry of the Word. A happy balance between positive instruction, admonition and defense will have to be found. Every discourse should try to maintain this proportion.

Pure defense has a tendency to weary the hearer. The faithful are not particularly interested in controversial exposition or the refutation of error. They prefer the meat of plain doctrinal instruction, and they do not, except in rare cases, stand in need of an elaborate defense of Catholic teaching.¹ In their eyes the cause of our holy Faith is not so weak that it requires continual warding off of attacks, but on the contrary stands secure and safe in spite of the daily assaults of infidelity. To them it is a tower of strength built foursquare on an impregnable rock. Undue preponderance of the apologetical element in the pulpit would have a disquieting effect on their minds and leave their hearts unsatisfied.

¹ "Eine Klippe, deren Opfer der moderne Prediger unserer Tage leicht wird, ist die allzueinseitige Pflege der Apologetik auf der Kanzel. Die feindlichen Angriffe auf der ganzen Linie machen eine ausgedehntere Apologetik auf der Kanzel notwendig aber das ewige Apologetisieren widert schliesslich förmlich an" (P.Joh.C. Schulte, O.M.C., "Die Kirche und die Gebildeten," Freiburg).

But even non-Catholics are not attracted by an excess of defense. The hunger of the soul is not satisfied by apologetics but by the proposition of the truth. On the whole, therefore, it will be advisable to use apologetics sparingly and with a generous admixture of positive instruction. It may not be easy to find the golden mean, as on the one hand apologetical defense is indispensable, and yet on the other hand it can readily degenerate into tiresome pleading, dry argumentation, and offensive polemics. The method of St. Francis de Sales, who unobtrusively mingled defense with plain exposition and infused into both the full fervor of his soul and the warmth of charity, may serve as our model. This excellent method, which is at once safe, charitable and effective, is described in "The Spirit of St. Francis" as follows: "In 1594, when he was sent into the Duchy of Chablais, he found only seven Catholics at Thion, its capital. He labored there for five or six years, aided by his cousin, Louis de Sales, and in the end brought over to Catholicity between forty and fifty thousand souls. His exertions seemed to meet with little success for the first four years. He lived in the midst of continual hostility, and sometimes his life was in danger from the fanatical Calvinists in those abodes of heresy; but his angelic sweetness and wisdom carried him through all. A pestilence which raged in Thion enabled the servant of God to win the hearts of the people by his saintly charity, as he assisted the sick and dying at all hours, by day and night, and was deterred by no fear of infection. The simplicity and gentleness with which he set forth the Catholic truth gave him such power that, provided only a Protestant allowed him a quiet and peaceable hearing, he would make his objections disappear almost before they were stated. His method was always to have some particular object in his sermons, such as the explanation of a point of faith or the inculcation of a virtue. He preferred rather to set forth the faith as if he were instructing Catholics only, without controversially disputing against objections. By this means the heretics, who were numerous, were gently led to perceive that texts on which they relied to defend their errors, if rightly understood, only proved the truths taught by the Catholic Church." It appears, then, that the apologetical element was not totally absent but artfully disguised and skillfully

woven into the texture of the doctrinal exposition. Moreover, it may be stated that the holy bishop added to his word the triumphant apologetic of example.

GOOD FAITH TO BE PRESUMED

It is quite possible that among those who listen to us there may be individuals who approach us in bad faith and with no intention of being convinced. We think that such cases are exceptional and that they should be disregarded. Nothing can be gained by a presumption of bad faith, for it will have an irritating effect on the speaker and edge his words with a sharpness that cannot but prove offensive to the hearers. "Charity," says St. Paul, "is not provoked to anger, thinketh no evil."² It is not apparent that harm can come from presuming good faith where there is none, whereas it is obvious that a suspicious attitude on our part may repel a sincere inquirer. The safest course is to presume that there is much inarticulate good in everyone whom we meet. The *anima Christiana* may be choked and stifled by prejudice, but it still breathes in every human breast. Ignoring everything else, we make our appeal to this deepest and best part of the self. An apologist who presumes bad faith places himself in an awkward, if not impossible, position in regard to his hearers and paralyses his own efforts. Professor F. W. Foerster offers a safe rule in the following: "The apologist who wishes to secure results in our day must have recourse not to abuse, but to persuasion. In dealing with adversaries he must not always take for granted that they are the victims of pride, that their motives are base and their intentions bad. Rather must he seize every opportunity to appeal to the lofty motives, to the deep spiritual longings of the soul that they have inherited from Christianity—and endeavor to strengthen them."³ This view is fully endorsed by Father Thomas O'Donnell, C.M., who writes: "It is most important to realize an inquirer's standpoint, his prejudices, his special difficulties, to make proper use of what he admits, to recognize unreservedly his good faith, and to give full credit to himself and his co-religionists for all the truth they hold and the

² I Cor., xiii. 5.

³ "Auktorität und Freiheit" (Munich).

good they accomplish."⁴ We may err in attributing good motives to the inquirer or the objector, but, if err we must, it is better to err by an excess than by a defect of trustfulness.

SIN AND SALVATION

The moderns are inclined to trifle with the truth. It must be brought home to them that it is man's solemn duty to accept and embrace the truth if it is recognized. This duty must be announced with all earnestness and sternness. Many in our days fail to realize that infidelity is a sin, a crime against the God of truth. Sin really has become to them a very shadowy thing of which they do not stand in awe. The consciousness of sin has become obscured, and therefore men do not seek forgiveness or the means of forgiveness. Only occasionally a burdened heart, oppressed by the sense of guilt, seeks the means of reconciliation with its God. The man of today must be made conscious of sin and of the need of salvation. Only then will he listen to our invitation to come into the Church, where sin is remitted and the soul restored to friendship with its Maker. A reawakening of conscience is one of the prime objectives at which the apologist of our days must aim, for conscience has become dormant and the realization of sinfulness practically obliterated. The Paraclete must again descend on a world forgetful of its fearful condition and unconcerned about the need of salvation. The men of our days are unmindful of the fact that judgment is awaiting them, and hence they live heedless lives. Not less than at the time of Christ is the coming of the Holy Ghost necessary in our days, for "when He is come, He will convince the world of sin and of justice and of judgment."⁵ Humbly the apologist must prepare for

⁴ "The Priest of Today" (New York City). Though at first blush Dr. Brownson's opinion seems unduly rigoristic, it can be reconciled with the one here presented. The great American convert writes: "It is a mistake, rather than charity, to assume that Protestants in general are in good faith and really concerned about their salvation, and therefore are to be treated always as men who are willing to hear reason and yield to the force of argument" ("Collected Works," Detroit).

⁵ John, xvi. 8. The decline of the sense of sin is described by Dr. Frederic C. Spurr: "Various systems have arisen differing violently among themselves, but all in agreement upon one thing, namely, that man is not a sinner in the sense set forth by Christianity, and therefore he needs no salvation other than that which he can effect by his own efforts" ("The New Psychology and the Christian Faith," New York City).

the action of the Holy Spirit by arousing the souls of men to a realization of their perilous condition.

The apologist of our days must have prophetic earnestness and some of the qualities of St. John the Baptist. In his voice the rumbling echoes of the thunders of doom must be heard, for it is only in this manner that the spiritually lethargic world of today can be stirred up. What Orestes A. Brownson says of his generation applies with even greater force to the present one, for since his day the world has grown more irresponsible to the needs of the spirit and less fearful of the retribution to come. His words possess a startling pertinency and might have been penned this very day. They are here reproduced at some length: "That Protestantism in most countries, especially in this country, is developing into infidelity, irreligion, naturism, rejecting and losing even all reminiscences of the order of grace, is too obvious and too well known to be denied, or to demand proof. It is stated in a recent number of *The American Almanac* that over one-half of the adult population of the United States make no profession of religion, are connected with no real or pretended church, and therefore belong at best to the class expressively denominated as Nothingarians. The majority, then, it is fair to presume, either believe that they have no souls, or that their souls are not worth saving, or that they can save them without religion; and the great mass of those who nominally belong to the sects, we know, hold that salvation is attainable in every form of religion, and many that it is attainable without any form. The point, then, at which we are to aim, cannot be doubtful. We are called specially to convince the American population that they have souls, souls to be saved or lost, and which cannot be saved without Jesus Christ in His Church. . . . The work assigned us here and now is a great and painful work. We cannot address those out of the Church as men who err merely as to the form of Christianity, and are yet resolved not to part with the substance. Unhappily, we are required to present our Church, not merely under the relations of the true and beautiful, but under the relation of the necessary and indispensable. We are compelled by the existing state of thought and feeling to present it, not merely to men who hold the truth in error, as the corrective of their intellectual aber-

rations, but to men under the wrath of God, as the grand and only medium of salvation. We must address the world around us, not merely as aliens from the Church, but as being aliens from God, without faith, without hope, without charity, without the first and simplest elements of the Christian life, as dead in trespasses and sins, and with no possible means of attaining to eternal life but in embracing heartily and faithfully and perseveringly the religion we offer them. We must show them that they have souls, that these souls will live forever in eternal bliss or eternal woe; that they are now in sin, and in sin which deserves eternal wrath, and from which there is no deliverance save in being joined to our Church. . . . It was by telling the people that they had immortal souls to save, and that they could not be saved otherwise than through Christ in His Church, that the blessed Apostles and their successors, aided by divine grace, converted the world to Christianity. . . . It is only by following such examples, by convicting those outside of the Church of sin, and convincing them of the fact, and of their need, of salvation, that we can recall them to the bosom of the Church, and persuade them to come into the way of salvation.”⁶ Such accents, it is true, will grate on the ears of our contemporaries who are used to the soft-spoken phrases of religious indifference and abhor everything that savors of religious exclusiveness. To the modern man the other world is no longer a commanding reality, and consequently his religious needs do not assert themselves with irresistible imperiousness. The horizon of time limits his vision, and he feels almost perfectly at home in these narrow confines. Neither the hopes nor the fears of eternity mean much to him. There, then, lies the task of the apologist of today: he must try to impress upon the modern soul the awful reality of the life to come and make the modern heart experience vividly the need of religion. Not until the need of religion has been profoundly experienced can the question of the true religion take on an actual meaning. Uncomfortable stirrings and persistent questionings must be aroused in the hearts of our contemporaries. Their self-complacency and their perfect absorption in this life must be shattered to a thousand bits.

⁶ *Op. cit.*

THE AMERICAN MENTALITY

The American is a good listener. He is not hypercritical but strongly impressed by sincerity. Authority goes a long way with him. Hence, when an individual has achieved success in one department, his opinions respecting entirely unrelated departments acquire an undue weight. Too often sentiment is allowed to befog the American mind and to becloud the real issue. The mental instability of the American is rather disconcerting; enthusiastically he will embrace an opinion today only to relinquish it for something else tomorrow. He possesses a generous measure of common sense and practical judgment, but is not given to keen analysis. His mental alertness is remarkable, and the wide range of his intellectual interests astounding. In practical questions his judgment is very reliable; in speculative questions it is equally unreliable. In many ways the American mind resembles that of the adolescent; it possesses the good as well as the evil features of youthfulness. The American represents a high type of morality, particularly in that which belongs to the natural order. This morality, however, on account of its inherent emotionalism lacks poise and moderation and can turn into actual immorality. Religiousness, though of a vague type, is also a characteristic of the American temperament. Many wholesome elements can be found in the American mental make-up, and these good attributes may be exploited in behalf of Catholicism. The absence of cynicism in the complexion of the American mind is a very promising indication.⁷ Much good is present in the American character, but it requires careful handling and patient cultivation. Still more can be accomplished with a mind that manifests the attributes of youthfulness than one that exhibits the marks of old age.

With subtle and rigidly Scholastic argument the American has

⁷ "Whether America is yet in its adolescence, or whether it is the result of climatic conditions, there is a certain buoyancy and delightful optimism in the character of the nation that is very much akin to the Catholic spirit. And there is also a depth of feeling and generosity which the older nations have long since cast aside in favor of the critical spirit. All this tells in favor of the Church; and I think if some great thinker could reveal the inner serenity and sense of security, with the occasional raptures that belong to certain choice spirits, particularly in our cloistered communities, half of America would rush away from the fever of modern life, like the anchorites of old, and bury themselves in monasteries" (Canon Sheehan).

little patience. The reason for this is his woeful lack of concentration, which in turn is caused by the feverish haste of our national life and the multiplicity of distractions that surround us.⁸ If we wish to reach this mind, we must use condensed and tabloid argumentation and endeavor to crystallize an extended proof in a catchword that will succeed in arresting for a moment the wandering attention.

Dr. Brownson, who undoubtedly was familiar with the mentality of his fellow-citizens, offers these suggestions: "My own conviction is that our true policy in dealing with the American mind is to study first to ascertain, not its errors, but the truth it still maintains, and to show it that that truth can find its unity and integrity only in the Catholic Church. We must find our *point d'appui* in the sound principles it still holds, and lead it by arguments, drawn from those principles, of the justness of which they can judge without going out of themselves, to the conclusions to which we wish them to come. Prayer, meditation, and reflection are better means than reading to prepare us to do this. The American people are a reasoning but not a learned people, and they want not the old arguments but new ones, and such as they can appreciate offhand. I think Father Hecker has the right view on this subject, and after him the next best is Father Walworth's, that of direct appeal to conscience. My own method, I believe, is the worst of all, that of logic. We have satisfied the American mind that we are able logically and historically to prove our religion. What the theologians call motives of credibility we have proved we have. The difficulty to be overcome is not logical or historical; it is the feeling that after all, though these motives are conclusive, yet to believe on authority is to reject reason. The error we have to combat is that the Church suppresses reason; and what we have to convince them of is that there is no opposition of revelation to reason and of grace to nature, and that there is a real correspondence between

⁸ "Professor Muensterberg thought that the source of American nervousness lay in what he declared to be a fact, that as a nation we are suffering from the weakness of inattention. We cannot, he declared, put our mind to anything that requires concentration, and we cannot follow a train of thought unless that train is exceedingly limited. President Butler, of Columbia University, would seem to agree with Professor Muensterberg, for he confessed in the April, 1924, issue of *The Educational Review*: 'Our great national vice is superficiality.' Another observer of American conditions finds that we utterly fail to appreciate

them, and that the assertion of the one in no way abridges the rights or circumscribes the sphere of the other. This, I think, is at present our work, and that our success under God depends on our success in performing this work."⁹

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

the necessity of concentration, though it is the one grand essential to success in any calling in life. . . . It is perhaps this dabbling in so many different fields with the consequent lack of depth that has led more than one European observer to speak disparagingly of the intelligence of the average American" ("The American Character," by Rev. Felix M. Kirsch, O.M.Cap., Washington, D. C.).

■ *Op. cit.* Brownson thinks the Scholastic method unsuited to controversy in this age. Though one may not entirely agree with him on this subject, his ideas are worth pondering. "Luther and Calvin," he writes, "brought the discussion of theological questions of the gravest magnitude out from the schools into the forum, and made the ignorant and unprofessional public, instead of scholars, the judges. We may regret the fact, but we cannot unmake it. If we refuse to address the people, we only leave the field free to the advocates of error. We have suffered the enemy to choose his own battlefield, and we must now meet him there or nowhere. In plain words, we have to defend today the Catholic cause in the public arena, before a light, frivolous, captious and impatient audience. We cannot do this by the Scholastic method—by long chains of syllogistic reasoning, elaborate treatises, or ponderous folios; for our treatises will not be read, and our dry, formal reasoning, however just and conclusive, will not be heeded. . . . The age is too fickle, too impatient, too much in a hurry, too incapable of sustained thought or serious application, to read books, unless light romances or sensational novels. Few are patient enough to read, even in the newspapers, anything more than the telegraphic dispatches."

“ARGUE NOT, BUT PREACH”

By THE RIGHT REV. MSGR. H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

My title is a suggestion caught from the last line of a poem by John Henry Newman, in which he says of the Apostles: “They argued not, but preached; and conscience did the rest.”

How far should such advice be followed? Should it apply to our ordinary Sunday preachments, to retreats and missions and even to apologetic conferences? Speakers in the Catholic Radio Hour confine themselves to clear statements of belief, since most of our difficulties arise from a misapprehension of those beliefs. Missions to non-Catholics do the same thing in the formal preaching, and condescend to argument only slightly in order to reply to inquirers or objectors. One supremely important argument is, indeed, sometimes required in the case of a prospective convert, namely, that of the authority of the Church to teach doctrine and morality. Once this fact is proved, perplexing details lose most of their difficulty. In our general preachments, however, is even this great argument necessary? Would not a series of statements implying this truth be perhaps more illuminating than formal arguing? Arguing seems to imply objections, and may create doubts.

In my previous paper on “New Haven: Then and Now,” I called attention to the Rev. Dr. Hall’s warning addressed to the divinity students at Yale to the effect that “Romanism” had not yet produced in America able apologists for our Faith, but that such apologists nevertheless existed in the Catholic Church and would ultimately find their way hither and mislead souls into the Catholic Faith. The question naturally arises: have our apologists who have appeared on the American scene since the year 1875 (in which Dr. Hall lectured) been more competent than those who preceded that date? Have we argued better since then than before? Shall we thus explain the wonderful growth of the Church in America since that day? It has been a wonderful growth, as Professor William Lyon Phelps indicated in the August number of *Scribner’s Magazine*. Our many churches are crowded in such wise that there exists no problem of church-goers and absentees for the Catholic Church like the problem that afflicts our separated brethren. And Catholics, as he further noted, have grown in prestige as well as

in numbers. Is this mighty change due to skilful arguing by our apologists? Dr. Phelps evidently does not think so. Might it not be that we have been busy preaching rather than arguing—preaching by quiet example, it may be, rather than by pulpit oratory? Or mayhap by both in fairly equal measure? Has our preaching been discreet and not provocative—ambassadorial rather than argumentative? Is it a generally good advice that we should argue not, but preach?

I

"Time hath a taming hand" (Newman, *Persecution*).

It is quite a coincidence that, on the day following my completion of the preceding article on "New Haven: Then and Now," I should have stumbled on one of Newman's poems that seemed to me to summarize, in a single line, the moral of that paper. We have been notably the victims of religious persecution in America, but "Time hath a taming hand." Dr. Hall's vilification of Catholicity and Dr. Phelps's tribute to it were uttered in the same city. The lecturer in 1875 and the writer in 1930, ministers by profession, saw the Catholic Church variously. One feared its future apologists. The other recognized only its "atmosphere of faith." Shall we hereupon quote: "This is the victory which overcometh the world, our faith" (I John, v. 4)?

It is a curious fact that Dr. Hall appeared to foresee that disintegration of Protestantism which is so very obvious in our own day, and which Dr. Phelps explains as due to "rationalizing" Christian truths. And Dr. Hall accordingly strongly cautioned his hearers against certain things which menaced, in his opinion, the Christian message. Catholicity was one of them, and he assailed it repeatedly and argumentatively. But he also warned his auditory to beware of two other things: speculation and subtle argumentation.

With respect to theological speculation, he declared that the preacher "has no business to say: 'I have been thinking of this theme. I have reached such and such results with my present light. I give you my conclusions so far as I have gone; they may be different next week or month, as I get further light, and then—for I am perfectly honest—I shall report to you with reasons.' . . . They (the hearers) might well enough say to us: 'Gentlemen,

get something settled, and then come and tell it.' We need not wonder if men *cease to go to church* on such conditions" (page 22). I have italicized the words that seem prophetic of the present "problem" amongst our separated brethren. Fortunately we do not indulge in theological speculations in our pulpits. We may dismiss, therefore, the topic of speculation as a field for argument in the pulpit. It will not be amiss, however, to consider here the other two points: assailing error and supporting truth by subtle argument.

II

"You see, although my sermon was in no way leveled against heresy, it practically told against it" (St. Francis de Sales).

St. Francis was preaching to a small congregation, one rainy Sunday, a short and simple sermon on Catholic veneration of the Saints. He simply explained just what that veneration consisted of, and his explanation restored to the Faith a gentleman who had abjured Catholicity because he had been told by heretical ministers that we made gods out of the Saints. The Bishop of Belley tells us of another incident:

"A certain sermon upon the Last Judgment, which the Bishop preached in Paris, was so blessed to the souls of several Protestants who came to hear him that they sought Francis in private, and were finally converted. 'I had been preaching,' he said, 'in the Queen's chapel, upon the Last Judgment (not controversially). Mme. de Perdreauville came out of curiosity, and was taken captive by the truth, so that three weeks later she and her whole family came to me for confession, and I was their god-father at their Confirmation. You see, although my sermon was in no way leveled against heresy, it practically told against it, God thus graciously using me as an instrument to win these souls. Ever since I have always maintained that he who preaches with love preaches sufficiently against heresy without introducing one word of controversy. Certainly, during thirty-three years in which God has called me to the sacred work of feeding my people with His Word, I have observed that earnest sermons on matters of practical holiness are as so many live coals cast among Protestants; they listen, are edified, and become more accessible to doctrinal teaching. All the best preachers I know agree with me in this, as in thinking that the pulpit is not a proper field for controversy, and that one casts down more than one builds up when touching upon such matters otherwise than casually in preaching.'"

St. Francis had still another method of counteracting error without arguing against it. He would take a text flourished by heretics against us, and, without arguing upon it, merely state or develop its true meaning. Catholics who had heard such a text used by Protestant argumentators could now perceive, without any darkness thrown upon it by heated words, what exactly the text meant; and Protestants who might be present at one of the Saint's sermons could similarly see the text in an entirely new light that was not shed upon it by the fires of prejudice or hatred, for the Saint carried out his own principle of always preaching through loving lips.

The Saint evidently trusted less to arguing than to preaching, less to proving than to persuading. Catholics themselves, as well as non-Catholics who may casually attend our sermons, will be more benefited by clear statements of faith than by elaborate, however intelligible, argumentation. The Saint elsewhere says: "You cannot conceive how beautiful the truths of our holy faith are when we consider them in a spirit of peace and tranquillity. We smother them when we labor to over-adorn them, and we hide them when we strive to bring them too prominently forward. . . . If the Holy Ghost do not illumine the soul with His supernatural light, all our proofs are feeble and useless, and we only place obstacles to the interior action of the Spirit when we heap proof upon proof, and argument upon argument."

There may be amongst our Catholic hearers some who are disturbed by nascent doubts against the Faith. They may be loath to manifest these anxieties in the confessional or in the rectory. They may possibly resent the counsel to banish such doubts as they would impure thoughts. What shall be done for them by sermons? The Saint seems to rely upon the action of the Spirit more than upon argumentation. Peace and tranquillity—that is the medium for good results in preaching. Argument may stir up new doubts.

III

"Be sure your theme is one the people can understand" (Dr. Hall).

The third advice or caution of Dr. Hall's begins with the above-quoted words. There is shrewd wisdom in his warning to avoid

argumentation on subtle and intricate themes. He continues to develop his thought:

"There is much with which your professional education has familiarized you that is out of their depth. They have no ground in common with you in certain directions. There are controversies metaphysical, theological, even experimental, into which they have never been conducted, where your argumentations would be to them as algebraic symbols to one who has never learned mathematics. You are writing in cipher and they have not the key. They make a little effort to understand, fail, sit down in despondency, with a little vexation and irritation of mind, where you ought to be regarded by them with complacency; so that they not only lose their time, but they are ill-disposed to you next time you preach, and have so far formed a habit of inattention" (page 111).

We are again fortunate that the latter part of this quoted paragraph does not apply to our congregations. If they fail to understand us, they are not despondent, vexed, or irritated. It is true that they—and we ourselves—lose precious time; and that, if our sermons are largely of the character described, they will regret that some more intelligible speaker has not mounted the pulpit, and they are apt to grow quickly inattentive to a sermon which would be quite intelligible to them if they would only bestir themselves aright.

The first part of the quoted paragraph may, however, be helpful to us. Father O'Dowd, in his volume entitled "Preaching," gives us an illustration of what to avoid. He draws a picture of our ordinary sermons on the Sacred Heart of Jesus, in which the devotional appeal may be overlooked by the preacher or the people in a welter of proof that the Sacred Heart is to be venerated with the worship of *latria*. But the people do not need that proof. They adore the Sacred Heart. To them it is practically inconsequential whether the human heart be the organ or merely the symbol of love. To them the Sacred Heart is the Heart of the God-Man, and they have never heard of the Synod of Pistoia, and do not consider the Sacred Heart as so much flesh separated from the Sacred Humanity and the Divinity of Christ. For them the Sacred Heart means Jesus Christ, God and Man.

IV

"For He was teaching them as one having power" (Matt., vii. 29).

With respect to combating contemporaneous errors in the pulpit, especially those of a philosophical or quasi-scientific character, it is rather interesting to hear John Henry Newman, recognized universally as a deep thinker, advising preachers—even in his day of turmoil—to "spare reasoning" against the opponents of Christianity. He does this in his poem entitled "The Religion of Cain," written in 1833. The last stanza runs:

Brethren! spare reasoning;—men have settled long
That ye are out of date, and they are wise;
Use their own weapons; let your words be strong,
Your cry be loud, till each scared boaster flies;
Thus the Apostles tamed the pagan breast,
They argued not, but preach'd; and conscience did the rest.

The pulpit is peculiarly the place for the delivery of God's message to man. Ambassadors for Christ are to deliver this message: "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth. Going, therefore, teach all nations." Subtle argumentation or profuse proving is not our need as ambassadors. In our age of printing, innumerable vehicles are open to our apostolate and are made use of with conspicuous learning and ability. Meanwhile, however, it seems to be just those people whose studies qualify them to take advantage of our well-expressed reasonings who, nevertheless, enter the Church from other causes, mostly from their own reasoning powers. But how many of these come to us from the camps of the speculative philosophers and scientists whose constantly changing theses we attack with consummate logic? Our converts are ordinarily religious-minded folk who find their doubts solved and their religious instincts satisfied nowhere save in the Catholic Church.

KEEPING BACK THE COLOR LINE

By JOSEPH P. DONOVAN, C.M., J.C.D.

If there is anything that can worry a city pastor sick, it is the threatened invasion of his parish by negro residents. Nor is his fear a groundless one; for parishes have been wiped out of existence within a decade by such a flow of population. What was white has become black—with the newcomers almost all non-Catholics. The parish has gained territorial status in a sense not contemplated by law. But, after all, the danger of parishes becoming thus extinct is only one of the incidents attaching to the quick shifting of city populations. If this destructive shifting is to be offset, it will have to be by civically and not ecclesiastically planned social measures.

Yet, this moving of the color line in our cities does symbolize a problem in the spiritual order that need not be, and must not be, dismissed as a baffling undertaking. I refer to the invasion of Catholic life by the unregulated marriages of Catholics to non-Catholics. This is an invasion that churchmen as a group can be not only lawfully but expediently concerned with. It is the approaching color line that should frighten us all into action. The problem, as I view it, of keeping back this color line is twofold. The first question is how to make the best of what in so many cases is a bad mess, namely, the infatuation of a Catholic for a non-Catholic; the second is how to prevent Catholics from keeping company with non-Catholics.

The first part of the problem diocesan legislation is undertaking to solve tentatively. Heretofore the attempt to prevent at any hazard civil marriages in cases where infatuations for non-Catholics were fully developed has brought about another evil, an ever-growing number of trial marriages on the part of the non-Catholics and of subsequent civil marriages for life on the part of the Catholics. We have too long refused to acknowledge as priests and bishops what we knew as men: that outside the Church there is a pagan—not an heretical—atmosphere, and consequently the promises exacted by the Church in all too many cases are only verbally and not seriously made. For either the non-Catholic doesn't know what he is signing, or he knows but, considering the exactions unjust, gives only an

outward consent. Even where the promises are understood and honestly made, their primary implications of a Catholic education for the children and of no artificial birth control for the parties themselves are not more than vaguely cognized.

Experience has gradually demonstrated the necessity of insisting upon a certain number of pre-nuptial instructions as a means of giving the necessary enlightenment and of testing out the honesty of the non-Catholic's intention. And where these instructions have not been too many to discourage attendance or too few to dispel ignorance and have been given intelligently and zealously, more than the expected results have often been accomplished. Maliciously intended trial marriages have not had the touch of sacrilege imparted to them, and civil marriages that may have occurred have been rectified either by a renewal of consent or by a *sanatio in radice* when evidence was forthcoming that the parties intended to persevere in their union. Bishop Rohlmann of Davenport—formerly a prominent pastor in Dubuque where the pre-nuptial instruction system has been strictly enforced—is quoted as saying that two unexpected results have followed from the mandatory instructions: a number of converts enter the Church by reason of them and mixed marriages grow fewer. And Bishop Gerken said casually last fall that his experience as a Texas priest had been that he made converts after marriage out of eighty per cent of the non-Catholics whom he could by suggestion or persuasion induce to attend pre-nuptial instructions.

But before I go into the direct means of lessening mixed marriages I might tarry to repeat what a vicar-general has to remark about the methods to pursue in giving these instructions. He contends that the Catholic party should attend, lest the non-Catholic end by knowing more than the Catholic about the Church's attitude towards artificial birth control and other vital conjugal matters. He contends further that for real results careful preparation and a thoughtful appraisal of the character and disposition of the non-Catholic to be instructed will be necessary. A second priest adverts to the need of going into the whole subject of natural and sacramental marriage, if the promises are to be clearly explained. He might have added that the background of the Church as the pillar and ground of religious and moral truth will also have to be ex-

plained. I frankly avow that the giving of these six instructions fruitfully is a tax upon the sacred ingenuity of any priest. Yet, at the same time the least good accomplished is something inconceivably great—the safeguarding if not the eventual multiplication of the Faith.

Here I might mention two clever schemes of giving these instructions learned recently from their priest authors. One priest uses the first instruction in going over the field of Catholic doctrine. Then he uses the remaining instructions in answering the difficulties he has raised. The other begins his instructions by object lessons. He takes the non-Catholic into the church for a tour of inspection, starting with the sacristy. He points out the parallel between the priest in vestments at the altar and our Supreme Court judges in silken robes on the bench. The altar is next visited and explained. The confessional is opened and calumnies silently refuted by showing the partition separating priest and penitent. Reflections are made upon the thorough inquiry the physician of the body conducts before diagnosing our bodily ills; hence the reasonableness that the physician of the soul should know something of the distempers that he is commissioned to cure or to prevent in the medicinal sacrament.

Now, a mixed marriage is always at least a remote danger to faith, and many an accident can make it a proximate danger. Even the wisdom of unschooled faith dictates that mixed courtships or mixed company-keeping should be greatly lessened and judiciously attacked as something ordinarily to be done away with. I might interpose the remark that a certain diocese in the Middle West now averages about one mixed marriage for every two Catholic marriages, so that one out of every three of the young folks of that diocese marrying goes in for spiritual miscegenation. The increase of mixed marriages in this particular diocese seems gradual; as far back as 1887 there were 354 as compared with about a thousand now, 407 in 1893, 502 in 1900, some 650 in 1906. We must of course bear in mind that the increase in population offsets greatly this apparent jump in figures. I am wondering if the country does not average about one mixed marriage out of every three or four marriages. The evident thing seems to be that the youth of the future must be deterred from developing a taste for the religious color line in the matter of choosing a life's partner. This

is just where the big part of the problem of the marriage of Catholics to non-Catholics comes in.

"Keep our Catholic young folks together, and there will be no room for mixed courtships," is a proposition every one admits. But under the most favorable conditions this can be done in part only. For work affords the occasion of courtships as well as social minglings under church or family auspices. A priest correspondent, whose "young people engage in a great variety of social activities to keep them occupied," observes that this keeping the young people together has done *something* to prevent mixed company-keeping. Parenthetically I might mention that the net entertainment proceeds of this priest's parish for one year amounted to \$15,000. Another priest, whose suburban parish has eighty per cent mixed marriages, makes a most unlooked for observation on this point. He writes: "Personally I believe we priests, myself included, are the occasion of more mixed marriages than we think. We are forced by the pressure for money to run socials for the purpose of raising funds. We hardly care who come to our halls as long as they have the price and help make the social a success. Our halls are the occasion of more mixed marriages than we realize. We want the world to know that we are tolerant, and in our endeavor to prove this we actually become tolerant of the occasions for evil. . . . When all is said and done, I believe the old truth still stands—spirituality is promoted only by spirituality." One of our bishops tells how, as a pastor, he used to restrict his entertainments to Catholics and thus avoided the evils here complained of. To resume, we must also take into account that, as our parishes become more and more American, they become increasingly nomadic. There is developed also a social stratification which renders a genuine mingling harder and harder to promote.

Still, we cannot rely too much upon what might be termed mechanical expedients to prevent mixed company-keeping. More permanent reliance must be placed upon moral causes, and these strictly supernatural. We have to inculcate a supernatural horror of a mixed marriage because a mixed marriage threatens the Faith. Therefore, we must instill a corresponding horror for mixed company-keeping, because mixed company-keeping is the only thing that can properly lead to a mixed marriage. I know that it will

be objected that instructions alone can do little. But I would submit some facts that indicate that instructions do have an independent value. Our honest-to-God Catholics, of course, don't contract mixed marriages in any alarming numbers. And this class is largely co-extensive with the auto-less Catholics. It is our middle class and our rich Catholics who run up the mixed marriage figures. Yet, in a study made by a Webster College student several years ago of marriage statistics among graduates of our Catholic colleges for women (surely a representative section) this truth was revealed: out of 3,600 graduates from nineteen colleges in different parts of the country 600 had married, and out of that 600 only 20 had contracted mixed marriages—less than 4 per cent. There may, of course, be certain other factors to account for this low percentage, but instruction undoubtedly plays the most important part. The converse, then, must also be true, that lack of instruction is responsible in no small measure for the unhealthy proportion we have of mixed marriages.

Under this head of instructional poverty let me quote a pastor, formerly a college president, who writes:

"I believe that many mixed marriages take place because of the lack of proper and thorough instruction in Christian doctrine in our schools. Oftentimes (this may be dangerous to say aloud) the regular instructors in our Catholic schools go no farther in Christian doctrine classes than hearing a recitation of the text; and this either because they have established such a method as a custom, or because they do not know *how* to go farther into the matter of explaining the doctrine of the Church on this or other subjects. I cannot believe (as evidence of this) that many of our young people would consent to a 'run-away marriage' if they really understood that such a marriage attempted before a Protestant minister or a civil magistrate is no marriage at all, and that in the former case excommunication is the penalty. . . . There is too much memory work in the Catechism class, to my mind, and too little intelligent digesting of the doctrine to be believed and practised by both children and adults. I believe that children should be *taught* to discuss the doctrines of our Holy Faith just as they are taught to discuss any other subject in the curriculum. In too many cases we seem to have become slaves to the standards established by the State Schools, and thus our most important subject is relegated to the mere question and answer method.

"You can easily see what harm comes from the 'parrot' Catechism class. I believe that one bad result is mixed marriages because of lack of knowledge of this sacred subject. Children should be made not only to know the doctrine of the Church on this subject, but should be made also to feel that *Matrimony* is a *Sacrament*, instituted by Christ, Our Redeemer, for the purpose of sanctifying souls and preparing them for heaven, just as they feel that Penance is a Sacrament or that the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrament. I may appear pessimistic; but I ask what does the ordinary Catholic know of Matrimony further than that it binds until death and that 'good' Catholics do not 'believe' in divorce?"

Since our educator-pastor wrote these strictures on prevailing catechetical methods, the Archbishop of Birmingham has banished the printed Catechism from the hands of children until their eleventh year. Yet, he has arranged for two courses in Catechism before that year, one from five to eight and the other from eight to eleven. Outside of prayers and hymns nothing is memorized until the eleventh year. And there is only a sparing amount of memory done with the printed Catechism from eleven to fourteen and fifteen. Children are learning *things* in religion in the Birmingham method, just as they do in matters of less vital importance.

That our educator-pastor has rightly described the tone of our schools is borne out by two pieces of incidental testimony gleaned from ethical examination papers in a Catholic college. One girl declares:

"Since grammar school days I suppose I have been taught that there are certain things one must do and certain other things one must not do. I have recited Catechism questions on the duties to God, to the neighbor and to self. I suppose I have been told quite often that, both as an individual and as a member of society, I had rights and duties. But merely reciting questions and answers or being talked to about certain things will not always bring these things home to a person. And I do not believe that, until I studied special ethics, I had a very clear idea of just what rights and duties are, and mine in particular. . . . I have begun to realize why we worship God. Of course, I suppose I've always worshipped God, and after a fashion realized just why I was worshipping Him. But studying about my relations to God as His creature has made the reasons for divine worship seem very evident. . . . Then in regard to taking human life, until I studied ethics I wouldn't have drawn any distinction between

direct and indirect killing. The very word 'kill' would have spelled 'sin' for me. . . . 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor ■ thyself' means now that I should have the same *kind* of love for my neighbor as for myself. That commandment was before always ■ puzzle for me. I can now see where it is necessary to sacrifice one's lesser goods for the neighbor's greater goods, even our life for the neighbor's soul, although I admit it was pretty hard to take that in. As for matrimony, the marriage impediments were always a jumble of ideas in my mind."

And in the same class a young Sister jotted down these few lines of her experience:

"The greatest benefit I have gotten from the study of special ethics is the knowledge of the 'why' of certain things. For example, I have known from childhood that direct deception, or lying, is always wrong; but under given conditions indirect deception, or the prudent hiding of a secret, is permissible. But the 'why' of all this was never fixed clearly in my mind until the Ethics of this semester. Also in the case of marriage, the fact that some things invalidate a marriage while others render it unlawful yet valid, was known; but the 'why' was not clear."

But if so much remains to be desired in the way of vitalizing religious instructions for the Catholic children in our parochial schools, what must be the plight of the other fifty and more per cent not in Catholic schools—those spiritually pauperized children who in very, very many instances have had barely enough instruction to make their First Communion? The easy retort to this question is to say that nothing more can be done for them, as ■ rule. I came across a demonstration of the contrary of this last summer. A former schoolmate of mine in college days had been placed in charge of a parish of mixed nationalities, strongly Slavic. He had a growing parochial school with over five hundred pupils, but the previous September he felt he should organize a regular Sunday School for his public school children. Catholic public school teachers do the routine work of instruction, with the assistants of the parish exercising an active supervision and with the Sisters mingling with the youngsters to get acquainted with the children and to impress upon them the fact that they are as welcome to play in the school yard as the parochial school children. The Sisters were long since forbidden by the pastor to make any invidious dis-

inction between the two groups on First Communion day. He keeps the children in this catechetical continuation school until they finish the eighth grade; and he was planning some means of giving higher instruction to the boys and girls in the public high schools. He began with an enrollment of 20, but he now has over 200. Dr. Scullen of Cleveland has lately given his fellow-pastors a detailed account of a yet more striking experiment in his parish of seven years' duration. Both these pastors have an active realization that their parochial obligations extend to *all* the children of their parishes. They are not *paroichi in partibus*.

But even the most perfect school activity, direct and supplementary, will not alone give our young folks the right attitude towards mixed company-keeping. That supposes normal Catholic life, and normal Catholic life in turn supposes the unspoiled sanctuary of the home. And the rehabilitation of that sanctuary demands more church activity. The pulpit, the confessional and the altar rail must effect the major part of the change. The church edifice must teem with life seven days a week. The schedule of church services in an Eastern parish must be everywhere duplicated, even improved upon. This particular church had 15,000 Communion for the months of January, February and March of 1927, and 26,000 Communion for the same months in 1928—a gain of some seventy per cent. The schedule runs: confessions and devotions every evening at 7:45; confessions every morning ten minutes before each of the four Masses; Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament all day Thursday ending with Holy Hour in the evening. And then St. Bernard dogs of charity must be sent out from the church to pick up Catholics who have lost their way. Imitators must everywhere spring up of the Chicago pastor who has brought back 600 fallen away Catholics in six years; of the St. Louis pastor who has through parish proxies brought back 200 in two years and closed two rooms in the nearest public school. Above all, the unstrayed and the reclaimed Catholics must be brought to the altar in numbers approaching that Indianapolis parish which had 309,000 Communion for the year 1929, representing an increase going back over twenty years. For how can the battle cry of the sainted Pius X be realized, to restore all things in Christ, without an absorbing devotion to the Eucharist as Sacrifice and Sacrament?

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

By C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., M.A.

VIII. *Facilius Camelum*

After speaking of the most spiritual thing in human nature, which is the mind and knowledge, and having merely for lack of space failed to insist on the Holy Father's repeated urging, given to all of us priests and seminarians, to increase our knowledge of all that pertains to our vocation, I would like to mention the crassest thing of all—which is money. The crassest, because sexual immorality can be mixed up with a lot of emotion mistaken for the best thing of all—love—or used as a substitute by men who are really hungering for something better. But money can quite well so obsess us as to stifle in us all other interests whatsoever.

Let me be perfectly fair. The clergy need money constantly: I myself have a scheme which to others looks incomprehensible but to me is clear as daylight, which enables me to see at once just how far I have got in either paying off certain debts for desperately poor priests or convents, or in helping to construct certain things I think ought to exist. A week ago today, had I not been ill, I should have been preaching a "charity sermon" in this unhappy church, which almost weekly allows hard-up enterprises to make special collections outside it despite its own needs; and in the evening I should have been broadcasting an appeal for the same purpose. No one can possibly say that I fail to appreciate—especially in this land where nearly everything still requires to be created—the need in which priests stand of money; and no one can say I do not take my wretched part in the sickening task of asking for or collecting it.

All the same, I will insist that love of money is one of the gravest dangers a priest may incur. I allude first to the great scandal given necessarily to all non-Catholics but also to many Catholics by the association of money with the Sacraments. Stipends for Masses is a topic that stands by itself: all the same, to tell people that the priest deserves maintenance, and his maintenance is *annexed* to the Mass which cannot, of course, be estimated in cash value, is the sort of statement that carries no conviction to anyone—to

anyone, that is, who is not equipped with that heroic faith which is able to see Mass as so transcendently important that, were the priest to do nothing at all save say Mass, he would more than have justified his existence. So he would; but everyone knows what happens to clergies and countries where priests say Mass and do nothing else. But Mass stipends have a history of their own.

But money is annexed to other Sacraments or pious functions: marriages, baptisms, funerals. Only today have I heard of a man who, having gone to another country for his marriage, asked the priest what he owed him. The answer was: "What have you got?" The man had a pound and some pence. The priest took the pound, adding that it was a very poor offering to make for a marrying.

The man, therefore, had to return to England on the return half of his ticket and a few pence. "What," I asked, "do you think of that?" My informant was not the man in question, but he considered that the priest in question was no gentleman; and I, had I given my view, would have put it positively that he was a cad, and that horsewhipping was too good for him. I have, alas, come across so many instances of this disgraceful tradition that my mind needs no further making-up as to its having existed within our living memories; nor need we rummage into history in order to find out how inevitably the red crop of anti-clericalism follows on the sowing of such seeds.

Leaving, then, the topic of asking any money in return for a sacramental service (in England, the regulation "fee" is about a dollar, which I receive invariably with shame, and always make sure that the giver is or anyway looks capable of giving it), I pass to the very evil effect made by our constantly alluding to money in our sermons. A very intelligent girl, whom I am instructing at a distance, wrote to me the other day to say that it was no good her going to Fr. X's sermons, because three-quarters of each sermon was concerned with money—the church "needed" redecorating. I knew the priest well; I know just what his sermons would have been like. I sent the girl for instruction (oral) to a modest young priest in the neighborhood, a man whose work is no less hard and to whom (I am sure) relatively no less is given though he asks for nothing; and she shall come, please God, to London to be "received." How many sermons have I heard, even on most solemn occasions,

like laying foundation-stones or consecrating churches, when hardly anything but money was talked about! I will be impertinent and add that, when I have preached such sermons and warned the priest beforehand that I would not mention money, and that if he liked to invite someone else he might do so, the "collection" has been above the average. "Your Father who is in heaven knoweth what things you are in need of." And He knows *before you ask Him*—He whom mostly one must ask.

The laity are generous: they are also trusting. I believe that priests are under no obligation to publish accounts of how much money has come in and what has been done with it. I quarrel with no principle. I merely say that, taken as a whole, to act upon this principle is less and less of a good policy. Glancing around the world so well as one may, more and more does one perceive the irritation of the laity due to their giving money with which they know not what is done. Very much, I know, goes on the generous entertainment that priests give to their guests, often clerical guests. At such dinners I have constantly felt extremely uncomfortable. "Whose money am I eating and, above all, drinking? It is kind of you to offer me Chartreuse, but I do not want it. I don't particularly like it; and, even if I did, why should I whose whole rôle, whole vocation, is to be the servant of God's servants, have better than what the *ordinary man*—I will not say, the poor man, who in reality has paid—can get?" The point after all is not what I like or dislike. Not even when I am offered expensive things that are *conventional*, like liqueurs, and not things that I really would appreciate, like Tokay: I would not mind being given Tokay in a country part of Hungary, where it would be pure, inexpensive, and "natural": but elsewhere I would be rather shocked at being offered good Tokay (not that I would be); and I am not at all fascinated by being offered expensive foods or drinks by men to whom humble people have given, at some sacrifice, small sums for spiritual things.

I have seen with delight a drawing representing the priests' house annexed to the Cathedral destined to be built at Canberra, the federal capital of Australia. Here is a simple, solid building, unlikely to need enlargement, and without any decoration. This seems to me excellent. A priest's house ought to have good drains, lest he catch typhoid; and a good roof, lest it leak, and he get rheumatics. It

ought to be properly colored, because color has a very great psychological effect upon people—much greater than most of us have studied. But there is no excuse for a priest's house being "grand"—let alone the only grand one in the village, the only one so "smart" as the general store (I don't know if there are general stores in the United States). In England, the waste incurred over presbyteries has rather been in the direction of making them in an absurd Gothic, involving windows that don't open sufficiently and much carving that is useful to no one and only irritates the eye.

I touch very briefly on my final topic here—decoration of churches. I fear I think that the decoration of our churches is usually very bad indeed. Our architecture has advanced infinitely faster than our ideas of decoration have. Personally, I hold that, save where there is a tradition (purely popular) as in most of Spain, the less we decorate our churches the better. In the whole world, I know of only one firm that makes decent stained glass; possibly of one only that makes good mosaics. Belgium, that can produce (as I recently saw in Bruges) sheer trash, can also produce admirable, extremely simple, inexpensive vestments. But I am certain that, until justice be done to souls in the whole of their Catholic life (such as by the building of hostels where these are needed), we have no right to indulge in luxuries such as expensive and—(as things are) with overwhelming probability—*bad* decoration of our churches. It is very easy indeed for a priest to think he is zealous for the beauty of God's House when he really wants to signalize his rectorate by a new chapel or a spire. I would far rather, for example, that an inland church went without its spire for a generation, but substantially helped to build an Institute in a port wholly outside its parish.

I conclude by suggesting that we periodically (*e.g.*, in retreat) read the Gospels solely from the point of view of what Our Lord *on the whole* thought about money; and also, to what extent He would approve of our receiving large sums from people who have made their money through graft. Of two things He would have disapproved—spending the small money of the devout poor on our own comfort or even glorification, and the accepting of "hush-money," as it too often is, from those who have got it in ways for which they will have to blush at the Judgment.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

As It Appeals to a Convert Protestant Minister

By A. LONGFELLOW FISKE

In a book upon "The Master's Blesseds," written by an English mystic and Protestant preacher, I remember these words: "Penitence? I will not try to define it for I want you to understand it." I have even forgotten the name of the writer, but the words have remained with me for many years, and today, as I attempt to write this article, they come to me with renewed meaning and force.

Somehow they express my attitude of mind towards the Blessed Sacrament, towards the Holy Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as I have come to know these in Holy Church. I feel that here I am treading upon sacred ground, and that any attempt upon my part at definition or intellectual elucidation would be idle if not sacrilegious, for I am yet but a mere novice in understanding the deep fundamental mysteries of the Church. I do know, however, that she has set before me a banquet of spiritual food, and I do know that here, at the altar of the tabernacle, I experience a spiritual uplift and refreshment such as I have never experienced before; and that my hunger for worship, for reality in religion, for prayer that is more than verbiage and an actual communion with God in Christ Jesus, has at last found a satisfaction such as I could not have dreamed of in other days. In discovering the Blessed Sacrament I feel almost as though I have discovered a new spiritual continent—or, perhaps I should say, as though I have restored for myself the principal pages to the Book of Revelation which were ruthlessly torn out and cast aside by the Protestant reformers!

Mine has been a rather long and circuitous "road to Rome," and now that I have arrived, I must confess that I am so utterly overjoyed and at peace, after years of mental unrest and searching for truth, that like the returned prodigal I had rather sit down at the banquet. I have no desire to play the part of the gallant knight who, upon arriving safely at the castle, cast off his armor, laid aside his sword, and plunged into the telling of his adventures!

I am sure that I am more of a mystic than a logician. In his abominable "Treatise On the Gods," the militant Mencken writes that "it is of the very essence of poetry that it is not true," and I would have the audacity to come back at him with a quotation from one of America's preëminent poets of today who declares that "the poets are the truest prophets, for they see the farthest." Not that for a moment I consider the Blessed Sacrament "mere poetry" in the sense that Mr. Mencken conceives poetry, but I do mean to say that the poet's instinct and intuition, the poet's passion for beauty and reality, his sensitiveness and insight, can most unerringly discover truth and detect error. God has made the greater prophets, and Jesus Christ is the laureate of them all. Art gave us the Madonnas; the poet in the artist gave him the ability to appreciate his subject, and then he presented his imperishable masterpieces to the Church as his prayers, done in oils. Raphael's fifty or more Madonnas are his rosary, each bead a wordless testimony of the artist's adoration. The poet in him sensed the truth of the Immaculate Conception and the sublimity of Mary, and thence came his inspiration to paint with the brush of super-genius.

Thus, I approached the Blessed Sacrament with the unrequited soul of the mystic, with the yearnings of the poet and his capacity to believe. I never could understand rationalism, although I was finally driven to unbelief by the fierce winds of doubt and materialism that raged about me, and I thought I had nowhere else to go, that there was no other haven for my shipwrecked soul. How I hungered for worship, for spiritual certitude and authority, so that I could hurl my defiance at all the Voltaires and Schopenhauers and Menckens of the ages, and declare: "I know that my Redeemer liveth! I know the Christian religion is true, not only because my soul says so, but because *His Church knows so!*"

Then I read a Catholic book, and the reading was nothing less than a supernatural experience. Stoddard's testimony in his "The Re-building of a Lost Faith" was a master symphony to me, as with the brush of a Raphael or a Titian he painted a picture of such transcendent beauty that I knew it was true—that it was God's picture of Himself living in loving friendship with the children of men. And that picture, indeed, is the Church, God's tabernacle with men, the dwelling-place of Reality and Beauty. I refused to

stifle any longer the "will to believe," but resolved to be led primarily by my intuitions—at least, to give my soul a chance to breathe.

As a Protestant minister, I had "conducted communion" many, many times, but I had always emphasized the "symbolic presence," and had declared that the service was only one of "remembrance." Gradually the ceremony lost its value and significance, and I found myself half justifying Emerson's act in leaving his church in order to escape administering it. Rationalism, the "higher" criticism of the Bible, a continual study of science and evolution and of the current psychologies, the complete absence in my life of spiritual or any other kind of authority, placed me ever upon the defensive as a teacher and preacher of religion, and I developed a "complex"—an inner conflict between intuition, or a desire to believe, and modern knowledge and the present-day rationalistic attitude. The struggle grew more and more desperate and poignant, until at last I resolved to break down the doors of the wellnigh windowless dungeon which I had built around myself, and to sally forth a spiritual adventurer, a bankrupt prophet with the instincts of the poet, pleading for the right to seek and find God in their own way. I would search for Reality!

In the Catholic churches I found congregations kneeling in reverential prayer. Here was humility, worship, faith—yes, I gradually realized, the actual presence of our Lord! Kneeling silently with a Catholic congregation, my stifled soul grew articulate and eloquent as it pleaded with my mind to believe and accepted the miracle of the Blessed Sacrament. Here was reality, here was beauty, here was faith, my soul insisted, and I felt within me surging tides of emotion that lifted me and threw me far up upon the shore of the religion of authority.

Then I returned to books—"my never-failing friends" to use Southey's phrase—that I might study and ponder, that I might obtain an intellectual confirmation of the truth which my soul and intuitions had led me to find and almost accept. I read Newman, Wiseman, Gibbons, Manning, and many other scholars of the Catholic Church. How perfectly did these great minds confirm the conclusions that had been reached by my intuitions! Their sermons were logical, conclusive, irrefutable. I was intellectually convinced

as well as intuitively convinced. The poet in me, wiser than the philosopher—the artist in me, wiser than the intellectualist—had led me to God and to His Church, to the Church that has stood adamant for centuries against the breaking, surging tides of infidelity and materialism.

It would be idle for me to go into an analytical, historical, or metaphysical discussion of the Blessed Sacrament, of the meaning of “transubstantiation,” “substance,” and the “Real Presence.” You who read these words of mine are far better able to discuss these things than I, and to elucidate them. I would simply point out that I learned after years of fruitless seeking, depending upon intellect and reason alone, that the best and truest guide, after all, is divine grace, the inner light of the soul. This is the lamp which God provides every man, and, if it is allowed to burn and is kept trimmed, it will lead him to God and the truth. Our Divine Guest would fain be the pilot to guide us in our voyage upon the sea of life. In this day and age we are deliberately snuffing out the divine flame within, and are so obsessed with “modernism” and the “scientific method” that we grope in darkness. This is the tragedy of our times, that “educated” men and women starve their souls while they refuse to accept illumination from God. Creeds and dogmas should not prove an impediment for the modern man, for, after all, “words are but symbols” and beneath every doctrine is the divine reality of which the doctrine is but an imperfect representation in language. Art cannot chisel in marble, nor paint upon the canvas, nor can the poet express in epic or lyric, the beauties and glories and perfections of God’s world; the ingenuity and deft fingers of man cannot reproduce ■ perfect rose in wax; and so, even the inspired intellect of the theologian can only partially, imperfectly frame and articulate in words the divine picture of God’s love and transcendent goodness. Our dogmas are inspired, but no more can the artist reproduce the sun than can our theologians reproduce in language the glory of the Sun of Righteousness as He radiates from His throne the eternal light to guide humanity!

Behind the Blessed Sacrament and the theologian’s statements about it is unchanging fact and truth—is Reality, the Reality of the Divine Presence. This, I think, is what the sincere spirit wants above all—*reality*. He senses the lack of it in many churches,

where there is so much of pretense and sham. A negative, naturalistic theology—a purely human Jesus from whose brow has been rudely, cruelly, snatched the diadem of divinity and even the crown of thorns—intellectual abstractions which take the place of sublime affirmations and historical certitudes, a sick anemic faith, these cannot claim a man's devotion or challenge his love. The sheep know their shepherd, and this is just as true today in our churches as it ever was upon the Galilean hills.

The Blessed Sacrament is the essence of reality—it is Reality. It means Christ's *actual* Presence, and the fulfillment of His own promise to His disciples that He would return and dwell with His Church always: "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." His disciples understood Him to mean a "true and personal presence," and further, that what He said about the bread and the wine as being His Body and His Blood was *fact* and not a mere pretty allegory. To quote Cardinal Manning, "the Blessed Sacrament is Jesus personally present in the midst of us, seen by faith, renewed in substance, known by consciousness, and adored in His glory."

Assuredly, this is Reality, the continual, material as well as spiritual presence of Christ in the bread and the wine; and it is our ineffable privilege to sustain our spiritual life by feeding upon Him who is "that true bread which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world . . . that, if any man eat of it, he may not die."

Of course, I cannot understand the miracle of the changing of the host on the altar into the actual Body of Christ. But why should that bother me? In these days when we divide matter into atoms and atoms into molecules and molecules into electrons, and so on—when we think of matter as "electrical energy," and have a million theories more or less as to what "substance" may be—why should my poor limited intellect falter at accepting the sublime pronouncement of the Church regarding Christ's "real presence" in the bread and the wine, especially when this pronouncement goes back to Our Lord's own statements and promises? More and more do I see this objective universe as a supernatural one, and more and more do I believe in the supernatural. Miracles are everywhere about me. God works marvellously, sometimes by direct interpo-

sition in nature; then, why should He not also work supernaturally in the realm of the spiritual?

I say that God works marvellously in nature. Can one explain the awakening to new life and beauty which we see all about us in the springtime, when the fields put on their garments of green and the flowers their robes of brilliant colors? Can one explain the bursting bulb and the rosebud? I think it was Walt Whitman who said that "a morning glory at my window satisfies me more than all the metaphysics of men," or something to that effect. And I would add that one rosebud, one song of the thrush, one leaf of grass, is enough to prove to me that this is a supernatural world, that God is a poet and an artist, and that there is nothing impossible about Christ's promise to His disciples or the doctrine of the Church regarding the "real presence" in the Eucharist.

This, indeed, is Reality! It is the answer to man's clamoring for a religion that satisfies, that postulates more than empty phrases or abstractions. It means Emmanuel, God With Us—with us always to impart life, health, grace, faith. That "reality" which the multitudes seek as they chase off to Christian Science, theosophy, New Thought, modernized Hinduism, or often in worldly pleasure and sin, we have in the Blessed Sacrament—the Living Christ, God incarnate, God dwelling in His tabernacle upon the earth, in fulfillment of His august promise to his disciples, which was a "hard saying" then and understood only by a few, and still is "hard," though now accepted by millions of devout followers and communicants.

I know now why multitudes fill our Catholic churches at the Sunday Masses, and kneel at the altar rail. I understand it. They have found Reality; they have found God. The Blessed Sacrament means to them the miracle of miracles—Christ's giving of His own life, His own Flesh and Blood, to those who love Him and seek His grace. When I first attended Catholic Mass, I was tremendously impressed with the seriousness and the devotion of the congregation. Those present seemed to be there for other purposes than to be entertained, or to meet their friends, or to enjoy a good sermon; they did not look about them and bow to their neighbors, or stare absently into space with more or less of a bored expression. They were on their knees, lost in prayer and

contemplation, some at the altar rail; and they were fearfully in earnest, as though, like Jacob, they were wrestling with an angel and had said: "I will not let thee go until thou hast blessed me." The altar dominated everything in its subtle influence and suggestion, and I hardly saw the priest who was chanting the Mass. And the pulpit—well, I could not have recalled whether there was one or not! Surely this was not a place for hearing a lecture; it was not a forum—it was a sanctuary, and there was a hush and silence and reverence as though men and women were in the presence of the Deity! I thought of Emily Dickenson's arresting phrase: "Take care, God is here!"

This, I now see, was Christ's ineffable gift to the world and His Church—Himself, His mystical presence "under the appearance of bread and wine." In the Blessed Sacrament He is adored in the glory of the Only-Begotten of the Father: God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God. "The Word made flesh dwells among us, and we behold His glory." This is the *reality* of Christianity—His mystical presence; it is the center and heart of Christianity; it is the source of all Christian grace, and of power and unity, for, as Cardinal Manning writes, "where the Blessed Sacrament is not, all dies." As a mystic, I find here the sublimest mysticism of the ages, and I have a friendship with God that cannot fail to grow with the years, and deepen and ripen. That stone which I had rejected, has become the head of the corner—the source of light, of grace, and truth. I now love the Church because God is ever present in her; I have faith in the Church because I know that her Founder still lives in her, and, from within, guides and directs her; and her altars are sacred to me because day after day, year after year, His sacrifice is offered anew—a perpetual Calvary.

Today I know that religion is not an idle, futile thing, but is the reality of realities. And I will say with Browning:

It is life of life, and the stuff of stuff.
Religion's all or nothing!
It's no mere smile o' contentment,
Sigh of aspiration, sir. . . .
. . . I tell you, men won't notice;
When they do, they'll understand.

THE TEACHING OF HISTORY

By PAUL E. CAMPBELL, A.M., LITT.D.

DeMaistre said that history as written for 300 years previous to his time had been an organized conspiracy against the truth. If this description of history remains true today, if historical works are honeycombed with falsehood and blighted by the suppression of truth, then truly there is no justification for placing the study of history in the school curriculum. Many historians so-called have been blinded by prejudices and biased in their judgments. It is difficult for any man to study and write about any subject to the total exclusion of the personal element. Judgments previously formed are part of a man's personality. We can never hope to eliminate all bias in the record and the interpretation of the doings of men. This is true particularly of any attempt to write the record of modern times; for, in proportion to our approach to the history of existing nations, men are vitally affected by national, political and religious differences. "An Impartial History of the Civil War," written by a veteran of the Confederacy, draws a laugh from the listener, because he knows that the point of view of the author must necessarily be affected by his association with the period covered.

Nor is a bare, cold record of facts desired. History cannot be strictly unemotional, or else it is emasculated. The vigor, the very life, of the printed page is a product of the emotions of the writer. But the inspiration of an author's emotions must be controlled. He must never fear to tell the truth, he must never dare to tell a lie. The Gospels are a model in this respect. They portray frankly the history of the beginnings of Christianity. They tell freely of the frailty of the Apostles who were to be leaders in propagating the religion of Christ. But the average author of the American school history of a generation ago was not thus fearless and honest. He feared to say that at Lexington Hancock and Adams stole away across the fields, but glosses over their threatened defection by saying that they were persuaded to retire to a more secure place. The honest historian of the period now tells us that in the early days of the Revolution open hostility was favored by a very small

minority of the colonists. Perhaps our quondam school historian, if assigned to write the beginnings of Christianity, would have varnished the denial of Peter, the skepticism of Thomas, and the defection of the other Apostles.

The honestly written history has no smooth path. Every reader has his prejudices. Some prejudices brook no denial, no opposition. When we add to this that the critical faculty is but poorly developed in a majority of mankind, we can understand the violent denunciation of certain textbooks that finds its way into the public press. Many modern histories have been written by honest, competent men, men of careful discrimination and critical ability, who have weighed all available evidence and presented the facts, as far as possible, without prejudice and with a neat sense of their value in historical narrative. These books, the product of a constructive mind, marshal fact and inference, and present an imposing array of sound knowledge and truth. But self-established critics, sometimes patriotic societies, have essayed to condemn them *in toto* because, forsooth, sufficient space or attention is not given in their judgment to the cause or the memory that they cherish. Sentiment and politics have played havoc in the selection of history textbooks.

With righteous indignation we denounce the effort of the Kaiser to entrench his dynasty in the hearts of German school children through the medium of the history text, but we calmly allow the Sons of the American Revolution to essay the removal of a textbook that is indicted for not giving sufficient space to the record of our War of Independence. If you dare to question their wisdom or their prudence, your patriotism is suspect. But patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel. In another case a book was rejected because it did not agree with the views of the Adjutant of the American Legion of Indiana. If we parenthetically remark that some of our zealous textbook historians, or publishers, have given to the welfare work of the Knights of Columbus in the World War space quite disproportionate to the importance of the work, perhaps our name will be anathema. The best example of the uncritical supervision to which school history is subject comes from Ohio where loyal Union veterans ask the removal of an official who dared insinuate in a history examination that Robert E. Lee was the greatest general of the Civil War. If removed, this official may

possibly find employment further southward. Opinions of patriotic societies are sometimes dictated by unscrupulous publishers.

History must be honestly written and honestly taught. The historian should not be hampered by the sentimental prejudices and the political purposes of men who know as little about a history text as the downtown New Yorker about the art of hoeing a garden. We are happy today in the possession of a number of splendidly written textbooks, properly adapted to every grade of school work from the fourth grade to the university.

This brings us to the burning question of the proper presentation of history. We cannot rest content with methods that were deemed correct a generation ago. *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in eis*. Since the report of the Committee of Eight to the American Historical Association in 1909 many important changes have taken place. There has been a marked shifting of population to urban centers. Well over 50 per cent of our population now resides in cities. The country districts have been brought into close touch with the city population. The auto, the cinema, the radio have done much and will do more to make the whole world kin. Increasing employment of women in industry, labor-saving devices in the home and new activities outside the home, have all contributed their share to break down the influence of the home and to weaken its power as an educational agency. There was a day when the home reading of the family gave even the young child a rich background for the study of history. But in this era of fleeting impressions and multiple extra-mural activities, the home contributes very little to the intellectual formation of the pre-school child. The school child looks upon his home, after the fashion of many of his elders, as a place to eat and to sleep. The change throws a great burden on the school, a burden which is heaviest in the domain of the social studies. The social maturity of the average American child is today far in advance of his physical and mental development.

The astounding increase in the school population in recent years also tends to complicate matters. There is today a smaller degree of mortality in the succeeding grades. A greater percentage are carried to graduation. One study reveals that the school attendance in 1918 was but 68 per cent of the school population, but that four years later, in 1922, the number actually in school had increased

to 82 per cent of the possible number. The high school population grew 288 per cent in the fifteen year period, 1909-1924. A study of fifteen cities revealed that 40 per cent of the high school population in 1923-1924 were actually in high school. One city claimed 40 per cent of the original enrollment in the first grade 12 years before as high school graduates. The school now carries the average pupil to the tenth grade; perhaps within a generation high school graduation will be average attainment.

These changes have affected all studies, but none more vitally than history. We cannot rest content today with the presentation of a few facts in our nation's history designed to stir the emotion and form the virtue of patriotism, to rouse the pupil to spiritual emulation of the world's great, to give him a sense of gratitude and a sense of responsibility for the social heritage he possesses. The horizontal treatment of history in the elementary school served fairly well for a nation of sixth-graders; but today, when the average of pupil retention is the tenth grade, good method in the social studies demands a vertical treatment. The manner of presentation must be graded to the comprehension of the pupil, but the law of interest is flagrantly violated by giving the pupil in the seventh and eighth grades merely an enlargement of a core of subject-matter that has become thoroughly familiar to him in the fourth and fifth grades.

The present futility of much work in history is due to the absence of sequential consideration. Isolated facts committed to memory give no comprehension of causal relationship. But history is the record and the interpretation of the accumulated experience of the past, and serves as the key to the storehouse of human experience for the guidance of man in dealing with the problems of the present. To improve the teaching of history it is necessary to have, in the first place, a sharp and accurate determination of specific objectives that are both desirable and obtainable. Following upon this there must be a determination of content in the light of these objectives. Much of the content in the past was merely a story of wars. The creative and constructive work of mankind is often a by-product of war, but we now try to make history a story of man's progress without stressing the incidents of warfare. The content must be organized for teaching purposes and adjusted to the pupil's power

of comprehension. In this many school historians have failed in the past. Some have presented the intricate problems of international complications to pupils in the seventh grade, while others have fed twelfth-grade students on a simple narrative giving with a wealth of detail, for example, a description of the cherry-tree incident in the account of Washington. These books have given way to better texts, graded in content and vocabulary to the comprehension of the pupil. Perhaps some genius will now arise to discover an order of social concepts corresponding to the growth of pupils. Many modern methods used by professionally equipped teachers give vitality to the teaching of history. There is no field in which supervised study and the socialized recitation have a greater contribution to make. The problem method will permit of a graduated assignment and some attention to individual differences. Since history is a study of the creative and constructive achievements that resulted in our civilization, there is a place for the employment of the project method, giving the pupil scope for creative and constructive work. Laboratory is a word that cannot be confined to the domain of science, for the proper teaching of history demands a laboratory. Let the teacher remember that any method is good which interests the children and secures from them sustained, intelligent effort. The examination serves the general method best when it is the teacher's diagnosis and evaluation of the work. Teaching that merely prepares for examinations effects nothing of value. The use of maps, charts, graphs, pictures and other visual sources of information cannot begin too soon in the history course.

The habits and skills that go into the use of such aids are frequently listed as one of the first aims in the teaching of history. This study brings the pupil for the first time into contact with reference works. His habit of consulting and his skill in using reference works are a splendid preparation for his more advanced studies, and will always afford an avenue for the proper use of leisure time. The skeptic assails history, or the study of it, on the ground that it means only the mastery of facts, detached, isolated and unrelated. If that were so, 'twere a grievous fault. Perhaps more grievous is the opposite extreme where the students are asked to voice opinions on important questions without any knowledge of the facts. The facts are necessary to form a judgment, but the

judgment should follow upon the mastery of the facts. If the study of history, even in the upper grades of the elementary school, does not train the reasoning powers, then there is little justification for its place in the curriculum; for, in the words of John Stuart Mill, "any educated youth of any mental activity will learn as much of the mere facts of history as is necessary, if he is simply turned loose into a historical library."

The aims of teaching history are then to cultivate habits and skills in the use of sources of information; to cultivate attitudes such as tolerance, openmindedness, and a feeling of the continuity of history; to teach a body of facts as the basis of future reasoning, and that a fact is established only by patient research and reason; to give an appreciation of our inheritance and our responsibility to preserve it to posterity; and, finally, to give the student the capacity to make a worthy use of leisure. These aims give the teacher himself the proper attitude towards the subject and the methods of teaching it. When he gives recognition to the fact that a knowledge of the past is indispensable to an understanding of the process of becoming in which man seeks the key of the present and the indications of the future, the teacher of history will evaluate, choose and employ methods correctly.

The child in the elementary school can be introduced only gradually to this vast and complicated field. When we reflect that the great statesmen who framed the Treaty of Versailles did not read aright the lessons of history, we appreciate the dark, unfathomed recesses that lie beyond the ken of any student. The Council of Eight tells us that we should endeavor in the first two grades to give the child an impression of primitive life and an appreciation of the public holidays. To the American child, Indian life offers a ready example of primitive customs. Two or three holidays at most can be understood by these young children. In grade three, when the child has some skill in independent reading, stories that develop an historical sense may be offered. Stories of great heroes appeal to the pupil at this age when he is naturally prone to hero-worship. The fourth grade pupil of our schools learns about the dramatic events of the exploration and settlement of North America through vivid stories of the achievements of the leading characters in that stirring epoch. "Children of this age," we read in *The*

Classroom Teacher, "are not ready for the more abstract study of history which emphasizes great movements and attempts to trace the development of social institutions and ideals." Children are interested in persons, and rather in what they *do* than in what they *think* or *feel*. A cleverly presented biographical sketch leaves the same impression on the child's mind as a personal meeting with a famous character. The comment of the historian Guizot on his own effort to teach history to his grandchildren is to the point here: "When once awakened and really attentive, young minds are more earnest and more capable of complete comprehension than any one would suppose. But when historical personages did not become in the eyes of my grandchildren creatures real and free, worthy of sympathy or reprobation, when the drama was not developed before their eyes with clearness and animation, I saw their attention grow fitful and flagging. They required light and life together; they wish to be illumined and excited, instructed and amused."

In times past various committees have assigned vast fields of knowledge to the pupils of the last four grades in the elementary school. Under one plan two years were to be devoted to biography and mythology, a third year to American history and civil government, and a fourth year to Greek and Roman history with their Oriental connections. Another committee recommended elementary ancient history, medieval and modern history, English history and American history, for the successive grades from the fifth to the eighth. Today authorities seem to agree that the work of the fifth grade should be a continuation of the fourth; some withhold the introduction of a textbook until the beginning of the fifth grade. In the sixth grade present practice prescribes the Old World background of American history. An effort is made to give a picture of ancient and medieval life developing into our present civilization. The child is carried back to Egypt, the cradle of civilization, to India and to China which have contributed a share to modern civilization. He learns of the Phœnicians who made the seas a highway of commerce. In Palestine he witnesses the beginnings of Christianity and learns the relation of his Saviour to the history of mankind. He passes to Greece and Rome that have given culture to the world. He sees mighty Rome crushed under barbarian invasion and a new civilization rising from the ruins under the leadership

of the Church. He traces the birth of the modern nations of Europe that were to colonize the New World in which he lives. Thus, he is prepared for a formal study of the history of his own country in the seventh and eighth grades.

Some claim that background history should be given to the child in the fourth grade before he undertakes even the biographical study of American history. But its present placement seems proper. Certainly the concepts and the vocabulary of present background histories are better accommodated to the mental development of a sixth grade pupil. In the seventh and eighth grades the pupil learns the story of the settlement and progress of the Colonies, the inauguration of the new government and the development of the political, industrial and social institutions that account for the growth of the United States. This plan seems best. Despite the recommendations of various authorities to the contrary, the detailed study of the history of countries other than his own is best deferred until the student enters high school. Of the history course in high school we shall speak at another time.

PROCEDURAL LAW OF THE CODE

Rescissory Actions and Restitutio in Integrum

By STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

A person who, under the influence of grave and unjustly inflicted fear or misled by deceit, has committed an act or made a contract which is not automatically void in law, may obtain a rescission of the act or contract by the so-called rescissory action. The same action may be brought within two years by a person who has suffered grave damage, losing through error over one-half the amount of the contract (Canon 1684).

In the preceding Chapter (Canons 1679-1683) the Code treated of the actions in court by which one asks for the declaration of the nullity of an act. In the actions for the rescission of contracts and other acts it is supposed that the contract or act was valid in law, and cannot, therefore, be rescinded by a declaration of nullity, for that declaration may be issued only when the law itself annuls an act. In order to protect persons who are induced to make a contract or perform some other act through grave fear inflicted unjustly by another person or who are misled to such acts by deceit, the Church permits them to petition the court for a rescission of the act or contract made under those circumstances. The courts of equity in the various States of the United States will rescind transactions where a party has been induced to act through fraud, undue influence or duress (force and fear in Canon Law). In the matter of duress or fear the Civil Law agrees with the Canon Law in that it will not set aside a contract or other act unless it "be shown first that the will of one of the parties was overcome, and that he was thus subjected to the power of another, and that the means used to induce him to act were of such a kind as would overcome the mind and will of an ordinary person" ("Common Legal Principles," I, 209).

Concerning error due merely to ignorance or mistake on the part of one of the parties to a transaction without the fault of the other party, the Code has a benign provision for cases in which the loss is very great (namely, one-half of the amount of the contract). Ordinarily one has no redress, and strictly speaking

is not entitled to redress where the loss is caused through one's own mistake, the other party not having been at fault. In the civil law the court of equity will modify written contracts and other instruments in writing when, through fraud or mistake, they fail to express the actual agreement and intention of the parties. The fraud or mistake may be established by oral proof (cfr. "Common Legal Principles," I, 211).

PERSONS AGAINST WHOM A RESCISSORY ACTION MAY BE BROUGHT

The rescissory action may be brought:

(1) against him who caused the fear or practised the deceit, though he did not do so for his own advantage but to benefit another;

(2) against every possessor in bad faith, and even against a possessor in good faith if he possesses goods which were extorted through fear or deceit; the possessor in good faith has the right to sue the person from whom he got the goods and other previous possessors, including the author of the fear or the deceit (Canon 1685).

The person who has suffered through fear or deceit has the option to sue either the one who caused the fear or deceit or the possessor of the goods or property transferred in the transaction made through fear or deceit. It is immaterial that the person who is responsible for the fear or deceit did not act for his own benefit but for that of a third party who actually entered into the transaction with the one who was intimidated or deceived. If the one who actually made the agreement with the person who was intimidated or deceived, did so in ignorance of the fear or deceit, he is indeed free from guilt; but, if he is in possession of the goods thus obtained, he can be sued for rescission of the transaction.

The action against the possessor of the goods transferred in a transaction in which fear or deceit intervened may be brought not only against the possessor who knew of the circumstances of fear or deceit, but also against the one who was ignorant of those facts and acquired the goods in good faith. The possessor in good faith, however, has the right to sue the person from whom he got the goods and other previous possessors.

In the case of error by which one of the contracting parties has suffered great damage (over one-half of the amount of the contract), Canon 1684 stated that action for the rescission of the contract is granted. The question arises whether the party in error has the right to sue, not only the one with whom he contracted, but also the possessors of the property transferred. Evidently not, for the Code does not mention such a right. There is a great difference between transactions influenced by fear or deceit and transactions made through error of one of the contracting parties. All that the law permits is to rescind the contract between the original parties to it. Canon 104 states that an act is null and void if done through error that affects the very essence of the act, or is of such a nature that it amounts to a "conditio sine qua non." If the person in error can prove a mistake of the nature described, it is evident that there was no agreement at all, for the very nature of an agreement demands a meeting of the minds of the contracting parties on the same object.

FURTHER MEANS OF DEFENSE AGAINST FEAR AND DECEIT

If he who caused the fear or deceit sues for the execution of an act or contract, the injured or deceived party has the right to raise the exception of fear or deceit (Canon 1686).

If a contract or other engagement entered into through fear or deceit remains executory, the injured party has an easy means of defense. He may simply abstain from executing the agreement, and, if the other party wants to enforce fulfillment of the agreement through court action, he can raise the objection that he was forced or deceived into the agreement. The court has to reject the petition of the plaintiff when the defendant proves fear or deceit.

REINSTATEMENT INTO THE PREVIOUS CONDITION

When gravely injured, minors and other persons who enjoy the privilege of minors, as well as their heirs and successors, may in addition to the ordinary means of getting redress apply to the court for the extraordinary relief of the *restitutio in integrum* (reinstatement into the previous condition), if they were injured in a valid transaction or affair which may be rescinded.

The benefit of the action for reinstatement into the previous

condition can be granted also to adults who cannot resort to the action for rescission or any other ordinary remedy, provided they prove that they have a just cause to ask for this remedy, and the injury they have suffered was not imputable to them (Canon 1687).

Minors in Canon Law are persons who have not yet completed their twenty-first year (cfr. Canon 88, § 1). The privileges of minors are granted by law to moral ecclesiastical persons. The moral persons are either collegiate (*i.e.*, a body of persons like the Cathedral Chapter, religious community, etc.) or non-collegiate (like a parish church, a seminary, hospital, etc., cfr. Canons 99 and 100, § 3). Minors have no authority to make contracts and other agreements, but must do so through parent or guardian. Since they are at the mercy of another, and may suffer harm in their goods and rights through the carelessness or ill-will of a parent or guardian, the law protects their interests by granting them the extraordinary remedy of reinstatement into the previous condition—that is to say, the agreements and other transactions made for them by a parent or guardian will be set aside by the court as though they had never happened. The same privilege is accorded to moral ecclesiastical persons, collegiate and non-collegiate, because they also depend on others to act for them, for the moral person is a fictitious being, a legal entity that cannot act by itself. It may be noted that the reinstatement into the previous condition refers not only to contracts and other transactions but also to court procedure through which a minor or a moral ecclesiastical person may have suffered harm. As to the question who may petition the court for the reinstatement, the minor, before he has attained the age of majority, may bring the matter to the notice of his local Ordinary, who can appoint a guardian *ad litem*; the moral person that has suffered harm is to be defended by the local Ordinary under whose jurisdiction it is placed (cfr. Canon 1653, § 5).

Adults may under certain conditions apply to the court for the reinstatement into the former condition. The conditions are: (1) that they have no ordinary remedy to get compensation for the loss they have suffered; (2) that they have a just reason (besides the loss sustained) to ask for the extraordinary remedy; (3) that they are not to blame for the injury they have suffered. As to the second condition, the just cause, the Code leaves it to the dis-

cretion of the judge whether the party seeking reinstatement has proved a sufficient cause. Under the former Canon Law (which in this matter was about the same as the law of the Code) canonists gave as a just cause the absence of the party for a grave reason. Other reasons given by them under the old law (*e.g.*, deceit, fear, error) do not under the Code entitle to reinstatement, because ordinary ways of getting redress for harm suffered through deceit, fear and error are indicated by the Code.

COMPETENT COURT IN ACTIONS FOR REINSTATEMENT INTO THE PREVIOUS CONDITION

The reinstatement into the former condition must be asked from the ordinary judge who is competent with respect to the person against whom the petition is entered. In the case of minors, the petition must be made within four years after attaining their majority; in the case of majors and moral persons, within four years after suffering the injury or after the cessation of the impediment which prevented action.

Minors and persons enjoying the privilege of minors may be granted the reinstatement into the previous condition by the judge even *ex officio*, after consultation with or at the instance of the promoter of justice (Canon 1688).

The action or petition for reinstatement into the previous condition follows the rules of the ordinary procedure outlined in the Code. The plaintiff applies to that court to which the defendant is subject; if several courts are competent to judge the defendant, the plaintiff has the right to choose between those courts. To determine the competency of a court, both the person of the defendant and the subject-matter of the action have to be considered, as has been explained when we commented on the competent court.

Time is a very important element in the prosecution of one's rights in both the civil and the ecclesiastical law. Canon 1688 defines the period of time within which the action for reinstatement can be brought. The law is favorable to minors, allowing them four years after they have attained the age of twenty-one to sue for reinstatement concerning affairs transacted during their minority. If the minor did not fully understand the harm that was done to his goods and rights in transactions made for him by parent or

guardian, he certainly has enough time within which he may ascertain the facts and petition the court for reinstatement. He need not wait until he has reached majority, but may while a minor bring the matter to the attention of the court, for the judge is authorized by law to investigate on his own initiative the wrong done to minors. The promoter of justice is to assist the judge.

Adults and moral persons, who according to Canon 1687 have the right to ask for reinstatement into the previous condition, are granted a period of four years to make the petition. The four years begin from the time of the injury done to them or, in case of inability to act, from the cessation of the inability. Moral persons have the additional protection of the law that, as in the case of minors, the judge is authorized to proceed of his own accord with the reinstatement of the moral person into the same status, as though the transaction which injured them had never happened. If, for instance, the administrator of a church or ecclesiastical institute has injured the rights of the church or institute by some contract or other transaction, and the judge or the diocesan promoter of justice gets knowledge of the affair in any way, the judge and promoter may on their own initiative start the action for reinstatement provided the moral person is subject to the jurisdiction of the court.

LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE RIGHT TO REINSTATEMENT

The effect of the reinstatement into the previous condition is that all things are put in the same position as they were before the damage was inflicted, except that rights acquired by others in good faith before the petition for reinstatement remain undisturbed (Canon 1689).

The very name of the action for reinstatement into the previous condition tells its effect. The transactions by which the minor, moral person, etc., suffered damage in their goods or rights, are rescinded by the court and the position of the parties is to be the same as it was before the transactions. The court may have considerable difficulty in putting the parties into the same status as they were before the contract or other agreement was made, for the mere return of the goods sold, leased, etc., and the return of the purchase money may not suffice, as, for instance, when the goods

have deteriorated through use. It rests with the court to decide what is to be done in order to indemnify completely the minor or the legal ecclesiastical person. If a third party in good faith acquired goods which originally belonged to a minor or a legal ecclesiastical person, the law of the Code does not disturb him in his possession, but the first purchaser who dealt with the parent or guardian of a minor or with the administrator of a legal ecclesiastical person will be forced by the court to indemnify the person who has the right to reinstatement into the previous position.

ACTIONS AND COUNTER-ACTIONS

An action which the defendant brings against the plaintiff before the same judge and in the same trial for the purpose of defeating or diminishing the claim of the plaintiff is called *reconventio* (i.e., a counter-claim or cross-suit). A counter-suit against a counter-suit is not admitted (Canon 1690).

A defendant when called to court to answer a bill of complaint has various ways of defending himself: he may simply deny the claim of the plaintiff, or he may raise an exception to show that the plaintiff has no cause of action against him in the matter, or he may put in a counter-claim. The counter-claim or cross-suit is admitted in law for the purpose of avoiding a multiplicity of lawsuits between the same plaintiffs and defendants. However, the defendant is not forced by law to bring the counter-suit against the plaintiff, but may let the trial take its course and afterwards start a new and independent action against the man who sued him.

LAWSUITS IN WHICH COUNTER-SUITS ARE PERMITTED

The counter-action may be brought in all civil trials with the exception of actions of spoliation. In criminal trials the counter-suit is not admitted except in the case cited in Canon 2218, § 3 (Canon 1691).

In all civil lawsuits the counter-action is admitted. The one exception concerning spoliation is easy to understand, for, when a plaintiff complains to the court that he has been either by force or stealth deprived of possession of goods or rights and therefore asks to regain possession, the spoliator may not evade the petition of the plaintiff by bringing counter-suit against him for other things

that he contends the plaintiff owes him. Legitimate possession is protected by law, and, if one is deprived of it by violence or stealth, it suffices to prove the spoliation to obtain from the court an order for reinstatement in possession. No other claim against the one deprived is admitted to delay his regaining of possession.

In criminal cases there can be no counter-claim or action, for it is the public authority itself that acts as plaintiff against the offender, and a person cannot offset his crime by pleading that another committed a crime against him. Indirectly an offender may by way of legitimate defense draw into the lawsuit the crime of another for the purpose of proving a mitigating circumstance of his own offense. Thus, for instance, the fact that another person induced him or misled him into the crime or threatened him with harm unless he committed the crime, would be a mitigating circumstance.

COMPETENCY OF JUDGE IN COUNTER-ACTIONS

The counter-action must be proposed to the judge who tries the principal action, though he is delegated for one case only, and though he would be incompetent to try the case of the counter-action if it were brought independently of the principal case; if, however, the incompetency of the judge over the counter-action is absolute, he cannot admit the counter-action in the trial (Canon 1692).

The law extends the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical judge over the cross-actions or counter-suits to avoid new lawsuits and finish all questions of rights and obligations between the plaintiff and the defendant in one and the same trial. Wherefore, the delegated judge who would ordinarily not be entitled to try any other case than the one for which he is delegated may try the case of the defendant against the plaintiff, and the judge, ordinary or delegated, may try cases brought by way of counter-actions even though he would not be competent to try the defendant's case if it were brought independently as a new case. The only restriction on the jurisdiction of the judge in counter-suits refers to cases in which the law makes judges inferior to the Roman Pontiff and the tribunals of the Holy See absolutely incompetent (cfr. Canons 1556-1558).

V. PERSONAL HOLINESS AND THE SODALITY

By JOHN K. SHARP

Thus far we have tried among other things to dispel the idea that the Sodality exists for spiritual purposes only. Yet, spiritual objectives must ever be the chief purpose of all Sodality effort. It has been well said that neither Church nor Sodality is supposed to supply recreation and amusement to the people, to run a matrimonial bureau or to enter business. We may indeed tabulate and compute statistics concerning the amount of the more suitable material good accomplished, but the spiritual, which cannot be measured, will ever be transcendent. The Popes in successively urging Catholic action have as consistently indicated its true source and the touchstone of its effectiveness, ■ good life, for only the good tree can bear good fruit.

Our Faith teaches us that each lay person is prophet, priest and king, and is called to participate in the very ministry of Christ. But first He must dwell in the layman's heart if the works of the latter's hands are to bear fruit. The spirit and program of the Sodality have not changed because the works of the apostolate are linked with it. This is but a repetition of the early life of Christianity when Our Lord and the Apostles were served by devout women. It is not revolutionary doctrine but rather a change of emphasis in Catholic life and the renewal of it. And it is a welcome growth in response to the needs of the times.

The personal holiness desired by the Sodality for each of its members is not of magic or spontaneous growth any more than good works can come from unpreparedness. Organization and direction are prerequisites, as in any business or material purpose. And if the Sodalist's attempts at personal goodness be sincere and persevering, her goodness should be fed, not distracted, by her exterior activity.¹

Our Catholic women need spiritual organization and the Sodality offers it to them. In an age that largely tries to debase women and

¹ Parish organizations are called "crutches" in the book entitled "The Soul of the Apostolate," but Dom Chautard, O.C.R., its author, also and rightly maintains that exterior activity can foster interior goodness.

the traditional spiritual standards, they need more than ever ideals for themselves and for the men to whom they are exemplars. Once again we may recall that "the Sodality aims to develop good Catholics sincerely bent on sanctifying themselves (personal holiness) and zealous to save and sanctify their neighbor and to defend the Church of Christ (active Catholicity)."

There are almost innumerable ways in which the personal holiness of the Sodality members is encouraged. There is personal effort and pious motives and grace involved in the performance of each good work and of each practice of piety. Again, the congregation of a number of young women of high Christian ideals and of unselfishness, banded together in a common cause for good, cannot but influence beneficently all the individuals who participate. The aggregation to the spiritual treasury of the Church as well as the good influence and example upon the parish cannot be computed.

First of all, the Sodality should be affiliated with the Primary Sodality at Rome so that the members will have the opportunity of securing the many privileges and indulgences offered by such union in a worldwide membership. The *Prima Primaria* is the First Sodality, and the Popes have given to the Jesuit General the privilege of communicating its indulgences to other Sodalities. This affiliation interferes in no wise with a Sodality, but leaves complete self-government to each branch, and makes the Bishop and the Local Directors the heads of their Sodalities. In fact, the approving signature of the Bishop must appear on the written petition. The Central Office of the Sodality will inform the Director whether his Sodality has ever been affiliated and, in the event that it has not, it will promptly handle affiliation for him. The leaflet which describes the Sodality indulgences arising from such union lists eighteen plenary and almost one hundred partial indulgences ranging through the year.

Catholic vigor and life come from imitation of and union with our Divine Saviour. The Sodalist practises devotion to Christ through imitation of Mary. The Blessed Sacrament is the center of this devotion. Apart from its individual fruits, the Monthly General Communion offers an external act of faith and means of union; it forms the minimum of Eucharistic devotion, and it gives edification to the whole parish. The majority of the Sodality mem-

bers are weekly communicants, and a number receive daily. The Monthly Mass, generally on the Third Sunday, will be announced as offered for those Sodalists present. At it they will be the first to receive Holy Communion, coming in a body and wearing their medals or veils.²

The choir sings at this Mass, and it is a truly lovely practice. The good custom of using the Missal at Mass is growing. In some places some parts of the Mass, if it be a Sung Mass, are sung by the Sodalists. The *Missa recitata*, permission for which must be had from the Bishop, is also being popularized. Apart from the pulpit and parish bulletin announcement of this Monthly Mass and Communion Day it is a good and quite general custom to send postcard notification of the event a few days in advance. Some Sodalities even supplement this with a telephone message. Mass may be offered for a dead Sodalist, and once a year for all deceased members. Needless to say, the Sodalists should be well instructed on the Mass and on the dispositions for and fruits of frequent Holy Communion.

The Queen's Work advocates a Eucharistic Committee, which simply and effectively organizes the Sodality membership so that all become members and are styled "Handmaids of the Blessed Sacrament" (the members of men's Sodalities become "Knights"). This creates interest in and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament under the forms of Mass, Holy Communion, Holy Hour, visits, etc. The members pledge themselves to Weekly Communion, an occasional visit, Benediction and devotions, reverent genuflections, Forty Hours' Devotion, the sign of the Cross made reverently, and vigilance for purity. Any member over thirteen can admit others, personally or by mail. The names of all members should be sent Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., K.B.S., of the Central Office, who will send leaflets and promise cards.

Second in importance only to the preceding is devotion to Our Lady and to all that the Virgin Mother of Christ and of men has

² Apparently Brooklyn is the only place where veils are worn by some Sodality units. Elsewhere they have disappeared with some other good things of past days. While a cause of delay and perhaps of some self-consciousness, certainly the dignity and loveliness of the veils are truly Marylike. Well, if their absence means more, older and longer memberships, we should not regret it. Experience has shown that those who prefer the veil will remain without it, and that those who do not like it are more apt to return.

stood for in the Catholic life of the past and present. She is the Queen of all Sodalists, and they are universally and beautifully known as Children of Mary. The Sodality is the great means of bringing Mary into the life of Catholic woman, and of cultivating a devotion to her that is practical and not merely a more or less attractive theory. Whether or not a special committee be formed for such formal purpose, it will always be the object of the Sodality's best effort to make each member another Mary. Startling and gratifying evidences of most unworldly faith in Mary on the part of otherwise worldly young members of a Sodality may be witnessed, and it is quite common to hear her standards and ideals appealed to in a Sodality business discussion.

The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin may introduce the general monthly meeting. Occasional explanation will make its recitation more fruitful. Some few will recite it daily. At least five decades of the Rosary should be a daily practice of the faithful Sodalist. Care of Mary's Altar in the church, care of her statue or picture in the Sodalist's room at home, and a conference or discussion of Mary's ideals at a meeting, are some other forms of expressing devotion. The solemn reception of new members and reconsecration of the old will take place on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. The cultural and pious practice of Madonna collecting will find favor with the younger members especially.

There are many other pious practices in active Sodalities. The Sodality meetings open and close with brief but sincere prayer. The good practice of an annual retreat, preferably closed, is encouraged. A sick committee helps by its visits to make the sick more patient. The dead are honored by a visit, the Rosary, and a Mass. Those who marry are encouraged to have a Nuptial Mass and receive a suitable token from the Sodality. A spiritual bouquet is presented to the young woman entering religion. In fact, where the Sodality flourishes there will be many vocations to religion. Prayers are offered, too, for the missions and occasionally a spiritual bouquet sent them, and who can say they bear no fruit? Prayer only is the guarantor of the success of any supernatural work. Lent and Advent find the Sodalists making "prayer cribs" for Jesus, and drawing up ascetic programs that need much pruning by the Director. The Director's monthly conferences are generally of a

spiritual nature and discuss fundamental principles of the spiritual life, life problems, and kindred important topics. Occasionally there are pilgrimages to shrines, centers of missionary activities, and celebrated churches.

An Annual Communion Breakfast does much good to all its participants. To it outside speakers may be invited, preferably women (although it seems that women listen more intently to men) who have achieved eminence, for the sake of the good example involved. Of course, no one seeking political office should be asked.

Finally, the Director should frequently refer to the life of Christ and to the need of knowing Him in order to love and serve Him better. The Sodality library should contain a few standard lives of Christ and a number of cheap copies of *The Imitation of Christ*, of the Gospels and other devotional works. There are many other, mainly exterior activities (those previously discussed as well as those to be referred to in our final paper), which, in so far as they involve unselfish planning and the spending of effort, are also spiritual activities that build up the Kingdom of God in the souls of their agents. Perhaps better than anything we have said, the following prayer of the Convention of the Women's Parish Sodalities in Chicago, will illustrate the spiritual viewpoint of the Sodality.

PRAYER OF THE CONVENTION

"Blessed Saviour of the World, Christ the King, in Thine honor and under the patronage of Thy Beloved Mother, we gather for the work of this Convention. Humbly but confidently we ask Thy blessing.

"We know how truly the moral safety of our race rests in the hands of its women. We realize our deep responsibility for the purity of the nation, the goodness of little children, and the ennobling inspiration to men. Our spiritual leadership as Catholic women will have the most farreaching results upon the lives of others.

"So, full of enthusiasm for Thy Divine Person and eager to serve the cause of Thy Holy Church, especially through our parishes, we meet to talk Thy interests, think Thy interests, and plan how we may, with Thy help, promote Thy interests. For ourselves, we know that the important thing is to keep our own souls pure and faithful. But we know, too, our opportunities to spread the truth by example and apostolic work, and

to serve generously and effectively our pastors and our parishes.

"Give then, Blessed Saviour, Thy blessing upon our work. Show us the glowing way of Thy example and we will follow it. Teach us to know better and love more deeply the truth of the Catholic Faith. Lift our ideals from this world of sense and flesh to the world of immortal spirit. Guide our discussions with the light and inspiration of the Holy Spirit whom Thou didst send into the world.

"We pledge our loyalty to Thy Vicar on earth. We make our act of faith in the teaching of the Catholic Church. We offer our lives and our homage to Thee, our King and Saviour.

"In the name of Christ Jesus, and under the protection of Mary the Queen, we enter upon and carry forth our work. Amen."

LITURGICAL NOTES

By THE BENEDICTINE MONKS OF BUCKFAST ABBEY

VIII. The Month of May As the Month of Mary

I. ANCIENT CUSTOMS ON MAY DAY

Strictly speaking, the Month of May as the Month of Mary has no place in these liturgical studies, inasmuch as the devotions which mark that month are manifestations of a purely private piety. The Liturgy as such takes no notice of the Month of May. But the custom of dedicating what is supposed to be—and often is in fact—the fairest month of the year to the fair Queen of Heaven, is now so well and so universally established that it cannot be without interest to try and ascertain how and when the practice grew up.

In this matter, also, the Church, when sanctioning and even praising her children's manifestations of love and devotion towards Mary, has followed a policy which has stood her in good stead throughout the ages—that is, she has directed towards a religious end, and so ennobled and sanctified, a custom that is older than Christianity and that seems to have been the common inheritance of the peoples of the Græco-Roman civilization. It is no disparagement of any one of our rites or ceremonies if we frankly acknowledge them as adaptations of pagan customs, because, as we have frequently had occasion to state in these notes, for the most part rites and customs thus taken over by the Church are the natural and therefore necessary manifestations of the religious instinct of civilized mankind.

We cannot say definitely at what time the custom of keeping May as the Month of Mary first began. We know that May did not pass unnoticed in the religious life, such as it was, of the Roman world, and later on the various nations of Europe, even those of the less favored latitudes, were in the habit of hailing the advent of May with much ceremony and rejoicing.

At Rome, during the last days of April and the first days of May, the *Floralia* or *ludi florales* were observed in honor of *Flora* (that is, the deified personification of the beauty and promise of the spring season), for by May nature is at her fairest in Italy, as anyone knows who has had the good fortune of travelling in that lovely country during this delightful month.

The festival of Flora led to the gravest excesses. Of these the genial season was made the pretext. Even Ovid—surely an indulgent onlooker—is content with merely hinting at these orgies:

The goddess (Flora) comes crowned with a flowery wreath
of a thousand hues;
On the stage greater freedom is permitted.¹

And it is, no doubt, to these solemnities that Horace alludes in one of his most popular odes:

Now it behooves us to crown our sleek heads with green
myrtle,
Or with a wreath of the flowers yielded by the earth freed
from the grip of winter.²

In the Middle Ages life was much harder than it is today. Modern material progress puts within the easy reach of even the poor—at any rate, within the grasp of the thrifty worker—comforts that to us have the appearance of prime necessities and which, not so many centuries ago, would have seemed luxuries even in the houses of the wealthy. In their cold, unheated or smoky houses, our forefathers must have deemed the winter months almost interminable. Nor were there then the means by which we dispel artificially the gloom of the wintry darkness. Hence it is easy enough to understand the naïve joy with which men hailed the season and the month which restored to them the sweets of an open-air life, light and color and genial warmth. Here is the origin of the various manifestations of popular gladness at the approach of Spring and Summer, and, since it is in May that Spring reaches its zenith, it was then that these popular festivals were held.

One of the main features, if not the chief feature, of all these customs was the wreathing of flowery garlands, which were worn on the head or suspended on the houses or carried in procession, together with branches of the freshly budding or flowering trees.

Tempora sutilibus cinguntur tota coronis,

says the old Roman poet, describing the spring festival, in words

¹ *Mille venit variis florum dea nexa coronis;
Scena joci morem liberioris habet.* (*Fasti*, IV.)

² *Nunc decet aut viridi nitidum caput impedire myrto
Aut flore terræ quem ferunt solutæ.* (*Odes*, I, 4.)

strangely like the quaint description of the May Day celebrations given to us by a quaint and fascinating English writer of the close of the sixteenth century:

"In the month of May, namely on May day, in the morning, every man, except impediment, would walk into the sweet meadows and green woods, there to rejoice their spirits with the beauty and savour of sweet flowers, and with the harmony of birds, praising God in their kind (manner).

"One May day, the aldermen and sheriffs of London being in the wood of the Bishop of London at *Stebanheath* (Stepney), in the reign of saintly King Henry VI, and having there a worshipful dinner for themselves and other commoners, Lydgate the poet (Dan Lydgate), that was a monk of Bury (St. Edmund's) sent to them, by a pursuivant, a joyful commendation of the season. . . ." (Stow's "Survey of London," 1603, p. 38).

II. MAY DEDICATED TO MARY

Devotion to our Blessed Lady, the gracious and radiant Queen of the Universe, is essentially something sweet and joyful. There is absent from Mary's countenance that sternness which becomes the face of the supreme Lord and Judge. All about her breathes confidence and love. In her we venerate the very masterpiece of divine wisdom and love. She is all fair and in her there is no stain, and she stands before us in all the radiant beauty of a perfect nature illumined and transfigured by the glory of an inconceivable supernatural holiness. With the Catholic Church we may apply to her the praises bestowed in the first instance upon Eternal Wisdom, in whom alone they are fully and literally realized. Yes, Mary is as "a vapor of the power of God and a certain pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty God: and therefore no defiled thing cometh into her, for she is the brightness of eternal light and the unspotted mirror of God's Majesty" (Wisdom, vii. 25, 26).

Seeing that she is all fair and unspeakably beautiful, what could be more appropriate than to dedicate to her the fairest of all the months of the year? Devotion to Mary is as old as the Church, even though its manifestation has greatly varied according to time and place. One could scarcely expect a Father of the fourth century to write as did St. Bernard or St. Anselm. St. Alphonsus'

popular books and sermons display an exuberance which may not—in fact, which does not—appeal to people of the sterner North, even though they do not in any way lag behind the Neapolitan's love for the Madonna.

In the first centuries of our era, our Blessed Lady's position in the divine economy was indeed clearly stated, but the insistence was rather on her divine maternity—that is, the virgin birth and her virginity before, during and after the birth of Christ—than on the many practical and devotional consequences that follow from that fundamental fact. During the first three centuries it was perhaps necessary not to put Mary in the foreground lest the pagans should look upon her and her motherhood as only yet another of the many mythological and too often scandalous stories with which their poets had familiarized them. But the earliest ecclesiastical writers make her unique position quite clear. Nothing that has been written later on surpasses the eloquence and enthusiastic love breathed forth by the sermons and treatises of the Fathers and Doctors of the era of the great Christological controversies. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that it was above all else the Council of Ephesus, in 431, that gave the greatest impetus to devotion to Mary, just as the Council itself and the City of Ephesus witnessed the greatest triumph of the Queen of Heaven when the Fathers condemned the heresy of Nestorius and solemnly and for all time formulated the glorious doctrine of the mystery of the Incarnation, at the same time as they triumphantly established her unique status as Mother of the Son of God. From that time onwards Mary went, so to speak, from triumph to triumph, and before many centuries had gone by her sweet festivals, like so many stars, studded the heaven of the Church's Liturgy.

The very popularity of Marian devotion and its manifold forms make it extremely difficult to discover a beginning. Perhaps, the great Swabian mystic, Blessed Henry Suso, marks such a time. It was his custom on the first day of May—when young men carried a verdant and flowering branch through the streets, which they called the *may*, singing songs all the while—to choose for his own *may* the holy Cross, inasmuch as it seemed to him that neither fields nor forests had yielded a tree more beautiful or richer in leaf and flower and fruit. The reader of Blessed Henry's Life is almost

sickened by the appalling austerities and tortures that the Servant of God inflicted on his poor body. Yet, this amazing ascetic had the tenderness of heart of a child and the imagination of a poet. Thus, even in his childhood he never picked a spring flower unless he had first offered some to the Blessed Virgin, and even after he had become a preaching Friar and entered upon his career of penance, he still "picked flowers with many loving thoughts, and carrying them to his cell made a garland of them. . . . Once, at the beginning of May, he had, according to his custom, placed with great devotion a garland of roses upon his loveliest heavenly Lady. . . . And when the time had come for him to greet her as he was wont to do, . . . it seemed to him as if he were in the midst of a heavenly choir and that they were singing the *Magnificat* in praise of God's Mother" ("H. Suso, Life," chap. 34, 38, translated by Fr. Knox). This takes us back as far as the first decades of the fourteenth century. If there is here no question of a Month of Mary as we know it, Henry Suso nevertheless marks a beginning.

Fr. Thurston, S.J., in a well-documented paper in *The Month of May*, 1901, states that the first printed "Month of Mary" appears to have been a little book by a certain Father Annibale Dionisi, about the beginning of the eighteenth century. Earlier than this Fr. Nadasi, S.J., published a book of devotions to Mary distributed over a whole month, but it is uncertain whether they were intended for use during May more than at any other period of the year. May devotions as now practised seem, therefore, to date from the eighteenth century. In the Preface to his book Fr. Dionisi indicates the chief reason for dedicating May to Our Lady:

"Since the devout clients of Mary are accustomed to venerate her at three different times each day (*viz.*, in the morning, at midday and in the evening), and also on one special day in each week (*viz.*, the Saturday), it appears only reasonable to dedicate to her one entire month in every year. And since in making an offering we ought to give of our best, so from amongst all months that one is chosen which is the most beautiful in the year, *viz.*, May, the season of flowers, which invites us to crown her with the flowers of virtuous actions" (cfr. *The Month*, May, 1901, pp. 481, 482).

"A man may say: 'True, but in this climate we have sometimes a bleak, inclement May.' This cannot be denied; but still so much

is true that at least it is the month of *promise* and of *hope*. . . . May, thus, is the month, if not of fulfillment, at least of *promise*, and is not this the very aspect in which we most suitably regard the Blessed Virgin?" (Newman, "Devotions," p. 3.)

Although May devotions, as such, are of recent origin when compared to the Sacred Liturgy and always belong to the realm of private piety, they have now become so popular and so well-established that a church where these exercises are not held can hardly fail to create a certain unenviable *admiratio*.

In a large parish, where there are several priests, it should be possible to have the presence of one of them each day, and if a daily *feverino* is thought to be too much, at least a reading from some solid book will make of May a miniature parish retreat. Hence the opportunity for doing good is great. Nor need the little addresses be explicitly and exclusively on Our Lady. It will make the exercises easier, more interesting and more fruitful if the priest gives a series of simple talks on the virtues and practices of a devout life—on prayer, holy reading, works of charity, etc., in all of which Mary is not only an inspiration but an actual and eminently practical example.

Benediction, at least with the Ciborium, would be a most fitting conclusion of the prayers, instruction and hymns of each day, and in this way Mary would still be carrying out her providential and most glorious mission of leading men to her divine Son: *Ad Jesum per Mariam*.

GLEANINGS FROM THE BIBLICAL FIELD

By ERNEST GRAF, O.S.B.

Εὐχαριστία—Εὐχαριτία

The word εὐχαριστία (Eucharist, thanksgiving) is by itself rich in meaning. It is one of those gracious words that honor a human tongue because they give utterance to a fine thought or noble disposition. But the significance of the word was enhanced a thousandfold when, like so many other words, Christianity baptized it and gave it a hitherto undreamt-of meaning. At a very early date it was used to designate the *Canon* of the Mass, that is, the essential and practically unvarying part of Christian worship. In Justin Martyr (*Apol.*, 65-67) the word designates the consecrated Elements: "After the President has given thanks—made the Eucharist (εὐχαριστήσαντος)—those who are by us called deacons give to each one present to share the Eucharistic bread and wine (εὐχαριστηθεὶς ἄρτος)». But though this acceptance of the word is the noblest as well as the oldest, it is not by any means the only one in which it may be taken; that is, though the word conveys and expresses the idea of thanksgiving, we need not necessarily connect it in every instance with a sacrificial or sacramental idea, nor with the idea of thankfulness to the exclusion of every other connotation.

In Ephesians, v. 3 sqq., we read as follows: Πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα ἢ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις· καὶ αἰσχροτόης καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπεία, ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία. The Douai version, following the Vulgate, renders this passage as follows: "But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not so much as be named among you, as becometh saints: or obscenity, or foolish talking, or scurrility which is to no purpose; *but rather giving of thanks (sed magis gratiarum actio).*" This rendering is warranted by the frequent exhortation to thankfulness with which we meet in the writings of the Apostle. But such a translation, which is of course justified and even demanded by the εὐχαριστία of the received text, misses the antithesis to μωρολογία etc. This antithesis is well brought out in Origen's explanation of the text and may be found in St. Jerome's Commentary on Ephesians: "Seeing that only the more

cultured among the Greeks are in the habit of using the word εὐχαριτία, as opposed to εὐχαριστία (that is, *to be gracious, to act graciously*, and to return thanks), I think the Apostle, who was a Hebrew among Hebrews, employed a commonly used word, choosing to express his meaning by a word that really bears another signification, the more so as among the Jews *to be gracious* and *to give thanks* are represented by the same word."

The suggestion made by Origen is to the effect that, even among the Greeks, only the more polished perceived the fine distinction between εὐχαριστία and εὐχαριτία, and that in ordinary parlance εὐχαριστία bore a twofold meaning. But it may be that Origen merely speaks for himself, expressing rather the feelings of a man of culture than the meaning of the original text. However, his commentary may perhaps find support in Colossians, iv. 6, where St. Paul desires that the speech of his readers should always be "in grace seasoned with salt" (ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἁλατι ἡρυμένος), which shows that the idea expressed by εὐχαριτία is by no means foreign to the Apostle, even though he is not thinking in the first instance, or exclusively, of merely natural grace and refinement of speech, but of such grace and beauty of language as flows from the presence of the Holy Ghost; hence χάρις suggests the idea of that grace "in which He (the Father) hath graced us in His beloved Son" (Eph., i. 6). We may then render the important text of Ephesians, v. 4, as follows: "Foolish talking, or scurrility, which is to no purpose—let it not be mentioned among you; on the contrary, let your speech be refined, or graceful." If we adopt this reading, we preserve the antithesis between "foolish talk" and "gracious speech" (cfr. Estius, *in loc.*; also an article by Dom Odo Casel in *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 1929).

THE BOOK OF TOBIAS AND THE ACHICAR LEGEND

The Book of Tobias is one of the most fascinating of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The historicity of the facts related in the story has been denied on a number of heads; even some Catholic commentators grant that the fact of the Book being in the Canon of Scriptures does not necessarily imply that it is historical. Thus, it has been said that the Book has indeed an historical nucleus, poetically adorned for didactic purposes; that it is, in a word, a

work whose teaching is inspired and unerring, but which has little or no foundation whatever in fact.

It has been argued that the Book was written in Egypt because of a tale related in an inscription found in the Temple of Khonsu, at Thebes, according to which the god Khonsu despatches his "double" to drive out of the daughter of the King of Bakhtan an evil spirit that is molesting her. His exploit once accomplished, the "double" returns to Egypt. The contention of the critics is that the author of Tobias has done no more than embody in his Book sundry legends that were current at the time among several eastern peoples, and which survive to this day in some form or other. Such is among others the "story of the grateful dead." A rich young man stumbles on an unburied body. Soon after burying it he loses his fortune, but a stranger offers to become his servant and share whatever fortune may bring them. In the course of their travels they came to the court of a king whose daughter was molested by an evil spirit that had killed several men to whom she has been given in marriage. This devil took the form of a serpent that came out of the woman's mouth. At the instigation of his companion the young man boldly sues for the hand of the maid. In the nuptial chamber the serpent duly comes out of the bride's mouth but is slain by the servant who now demands half of the woman, since they had agreed to share whatever fortune they might come into. The servant cuts the woman in two, thus revealing a nest of small serpents. Having destroyed them, he rejoins the halves, restores the woman to her husband, and reveals himself as the man to whose body the youth had given burial.

In Tobias, xi. 20, mention is made of Achior and Nabath, kinsmen of Tobias. The Greek text of the Septuagint call Achior "Achiacharos." It was he who was able to procure the elder Tobias' pardon and leave to return to his own after the assassination of Sennacherib, for he had been a high official of that king. Legend has been busy about him. It tells us that he adopted his nephew Nadan as his son and heir, but when he sought to reform this extravagant young man, the latter accused his benefactor of treason. Achicar was condemned to death. Now, it so happened that the officer in charge of the execution had himself been saved from death by Achicar; so he beheaded a slave in his stead. The

King of Egypt having challenged the King of Assyria to build him a palace between heaven and earth, Nadan, who had succeeded Achicar as counsellor to the King, is helpless, but the officer reveals to Esarhaddon the fact that Achicar is alive. On being summoned to court, Achicar taught two boys to soar into the air on the backs of tethered eagles and then to call for bricks and mortar. The Pharaoh being unable to send up the required materials has to acknowledge himself defeated.

We have here a tale of which many versions exist. It has been asserted that the author of Tobias made use of the name of Achicar in order to enhance the value of his work, for the latter was renowned for his wise sayings. Recent finds at Elephantinæ, near Assouan, give us an Aramaic version of the story in which we have the correct order of the Assyrian kings, which is not the case in any other version of the legend. This version dates from not later than the fifth or sixth century B. C. It omits the fantastic elements found in other accounts—especially the Egyptian incident—so that the residue of the varied legends seems to be the historical fact that Achicar was a high official of the Assyrian king, who fell into disgrace and spent his enforced leisure in the compiling of maxims and moral discourses.

Instead of trying to prove the legendary excrescences round the person of Achicar furnished the subject matter of the Book of Tobias, it seems on the contrary more rational to conclude that these legends have their historical basis in the simple, unadorned story which we read in the Book of Tobias. The true account of what befell Tobias is found in the inspired book of the Old Testament, an account written either by the principal personage himself or by his contemporaries. But legend also got hold of these events, and the fantastic tale of the “grateful dead” and the legend woven round Achicar were the result. Such a development is by no means unique; thus there is no human race that has not its story of the flood—but these often grotesque legends are but travesties of a primitive tradition of an historical event that impressed itself very deeply upon humanity, and it would be preposterous (taking that word in its etymological meaning) to say that the Bible account of the flood is the result of those traditions. It is enough to refer the reader to the first book of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, though in this

case it is possible that the Latin poet had read, or heard of, the Bible account and merely travestied it. On the other hand, as Ovid seems to have made a serious study of mythology, his description may well represent the traditions that still lingered in his days (cfr. Dr. Selbst, "Handb. zur bibl. Geschichte," I, p. 861, and Fr. J. O'Carroll, S.J., in *The Dublin Review*, October, 1929).

WAS ST. PAUL THE RICH YOUNG MAN
OF MATTHEW, XIX. 16, ETC.?

We shall never know for certain who was the rich young man who one day ran after Our Lord to inquire on what conditions he might have life everlasting. In *The Church Quarterly Review* (Anglican) of August, 1929, a curious suggestion is made to the effect that the youth in question may have been St. Paul. That Saul must have been fairly well off would be likely enough, since he was able to leave his native city in order to sit at the feet of Gamaliel, and he was evidently in a position to maintain himself in Jerusalem, where he enjoyed influence that may or may not have been exclusively the fruit of his zeal for the Lord. After his conversion he had always to contend with real poverty, though he never accepted any personal gift. If Paul was the young man who at first refused to answer the call of grace and then stripped himself of everything he possessed, he would indeed have nobly atoned for his first refusal. In this eventuality also we would find a natural explanation of the Apostle's claim to have seen the Lord, though this encounter would by no means exclude the other visions of the Lord with which he was subsequently favored. But if this hypothesis is true, he too would have seen the Lord in the conditions of His mortality, as the rest of the Apostolic College had seen Him. At any rate, Paul was still a young man at the time of Our Lord's death. At St. Stephen's death the witnesses "laid their garments at the feet of a young man called Saul," and, like the youth of the Gospel who claimed to have kept all these things "from my youth," Paul was "according to the justice that is in the law, conversing without blame" (Phil., iii. 6).

We cannot hope for certainty in this matter, but the suggestion of the identity of the good young man with the Paul of the Acts is certainly not without interest.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

IS THE PASTOR OR PARISH THE OWNER AND ADMINISTRATOR OF FUNDS OF CHURCH SOCIETIES?

Question: Are the funds collected by the Ladies' Altar Society directly church property to be administered by the parish-priest? May a pastor order the Society to turn over its funds to him to pay the interest on the parish debt? In one instance where the pastor demanded this the Altar Society objected, and when the pastor did insist on taking their funds for the parish debt, the Society disbanded.

Who is the administrator of the funds of the Catholic Women's League? These ladies do a great deal of good, yet it is claimed that they are spending money which belongs to the parish. May the pastor object if the League makes an occasional donation from their funds to institutions outside the parish? May he object to their using some of the funds (*e.g.*) to send delegates to conventions of the League and for other purposes within the scope of the organization? Are their funds ecclesiastical property or are they non-ecclesiastical? What about the funds of the Knights of Columbus, Catholic Foresters, and other Catholic societies? Are they *bona ecclesiastica*, or are they merely goods of a secular character owned by an organization of Catholics?

PERPLEXUS.

Answer: The law is sufficiently clear on the status of associations or societies erected or approved by the Church. They are a distinct legal ecclesiastical body or person, just as a parish is a legal personage in Canon Law. The funds of a legal ecclesiastical person or body are ecclesiastical goods (cfr. Canon 1497, § 1). From that fact it does not follow that the pastor of the church where such ecclesiastical societies are established is the administrator of the goods or funds of the societies, nor does it follow that the parish has any right or claim to those goods. On the contrary, the law of the Church rules that the societies can possess and administer temporal goods under the authority of the Ordinary, to whom the society must at least once a year render an account. The pastor has nothing to do with the funds of the society unless the Ordinary himself has given him some authority in the matter (cfr. Canon 691, § 1). The society has the right to accept offerings and to expend them for the religious or charitable purposes of the society according to its statutes. The societies have the right, according to their statutes and the sacred canons, to hold meetings,

publish special rules concerning the societies, elect administrators of their goods and other officers (cfr. Canon 697, § 1).

Other organizations of Catholic lay persons—such as the Knights of Columbus, Catholic Women's League, and many other organizations instituted for religious or charitable purposes—are not ecclesiastical societies. They have not the standing of legal ecclesiastical bodies or persons, but are usually incorporated as legal persons under the law of the State. They can, of course, be erected by the Ordinary into a legal ecclesiastical society or organization, but that is not necessary. If they are not ecclesiastical societies, their goods are not *bona ecclesiastica*, and therefore not under the jurisdiction of the Church. Their own statutes alone determine the administration and use of the goods. The Local Ordinary has the supervision over the activities of such organizations in so far as Catholic life and morality are concerned, but not in other matters. The whole question concerning organizations of Catholic lay persons for religious or charitable purposes, and the distinction between societies pursuing such purposes erected as legal ecclesiastical bodies and others not so erected but existing as legal bodies under the law of the State, was discussed at length in the case of the St. Vincent de Paul Society (cfr. *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*, XIII, 135-144).

SOME DIFFICULTY ABOUT AVOIDING VIOLATION OF SEAL OF CONFESSION IN HEARING PATIENTS IN HOSPITALS—MISTAKE IN JUDGMENT DISCOVERED AFTER CONFESSION

Question: If the priest is called by the Sisters of a Hospital to hear the confession of patients who are well known to the Sisters as benefactors of the Hospital and for whom they have prepared everything in connection with Holy Communion, what is the priest to do if he finds that they have a reserved sin? He cannot without arousing suspicion say that they do not want to receive, nor can he telephone to the bishop without some danger of betraying the penitents' sin. What should the priest do?

If the confessor at the time of the confession judges that there has been no guilt on the part of the woman in a premature birth because he knew the person as a good and conscientious Catholic, and later on ascertains from others the fact that she was to blame for that condition, is the priest bound to rectify his mistake?

CONFESSOR.

Answer: When a person goes to confession, whether in church

or in a hospital, and the priest cannot give absolution because the penitent does not have the necessary dispositions, he cannot receive Holy Communion though others know that he has made his confession and expect him to receive Holy Communion. By going to confession we make a more or less public acknowledgment of our sinfulness, and we also run the risk of not being admitted to Holy Communion if the confessor should judge that we are not at the time worthy of absolution. That much of public penance remains from the old discipline of the Sacrament of Penance, something that is incidentally connected with the atonement for our sins. One should not say that the priest who finds that he cannot give absolution makes public the sinfulness of the penitent, but rather the penitent himself is the one who subjects himself to the discipline of the Sacrament of Penance and its consequences. Because of the hardship of suffering refusal of absolution, every priest has been instructed in his course of theology not to refuse absolution unless he cannot in conscience do otherwise. If there is question of a censure or of a reserved sin and the penitent is properly disposed for absolution, there is no difficulty in absolving him from the censure, for Canon 2254, § 1, gives the confessor faculty to absolve with the obligation of having recourse to the Holy See or to the bishop (if the latter has the faculty to absolve from the papal censures) within a month by letter and through the confessor. If it is a diocesan reserved sin, there is the concession of Canon 900 permitting the absolution of persons who confess on a sick bed, though there is no danger of death. There is in the same Canon the further concession to absolve without getting the faculty from the Ordinary, if the faculty to absolve cannot be obtained without great inconvenience to the penitent, or if there is danger of the violation of the seal of confession in asking for the faculty. Our correspondent speaks of using the telephone for the purpose of getting the faculty to absolve. The Holy See has declared that the telephone is not a proper medium for that purpose.

As to mistakes in absolving a person that had a reserved sin, the penitent properly disposed was absolved directly from the non-reserved sins and indirectly from the reserved sin. Moralists advise that the confessor should get the faculty to absolve if there is a chance that the same penitent may come again to confession to

the same priest. However, in most cases the priest would not know the penitent, and it would be practically useless to do anything further in the matter.

MAY PAST GOOD WORKS SUFFICE FOR SACRAMENTAL PENANCE?

Questions Can a priest give a penance outside of the confessional, and later after hearing the same matter in confession let the penitent go without imposing further penance? If a person says the Rosary with his family, does that suffice for the saying of the Rosary as a penance? If one says the Rosary regularly, would one be justified in counting a previous Rosary sufficient for the one imposed later in penance? CONFESSOR.

Answer: We do not know what our correspondent means by saying that a priest gives a penance outside the confessional, for he has no authority to impose penances outside the sacramental confession. If he means that the priest suggested some penance that a person should do who told him outside of the confessional about some sin or misdeed, the priest may certainly give the same in penance. If a penitent has the habit of saying the Rosary with the family (*e.g.*, during the month of October according to the custom of devout Christian families), the prayers thus to be said may be imposed as penance. Even obligatory good works (like the hearing of Holy Mass, fast or abstinence on days when there is already an obligation by the law of the Church) may be appointed by the confessors as sacramental penance. Moralists point out that, when a penitent has committed several serious sins, the spirit of the Sacrament of Penance requires that some other good works besides those already obligatory should be imposed. That is evident from the very nature of the Sacrament and from the ancient discipline of the Church, but the circumstances of the penitent's age, character, occupation and duties have to be taken into account by the confessor in order that he may not impose penances which are impractical or too difficult.

Past good works can hardly be imposed as penance, because they are past and the penance to be imposed in confession has reference to good works to be done after the accusation of the sins. It may happen that a penitent after the commission of some serious sin has of his own accord done good works specially in atonement for the sin, and in that case the confessor would be justified in imposing a less severe penance than he would do otherwise.

EXTENT OF AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OVER THE LIFE OF CRIMINALS

Question: What is the moral aspect of the killing of prisoners by police or state troopers who make no attempt to prevent an effort of jail breaking but lie in wait and shoot to kill at the moment when prisoners try to escape? When a sheriff gets notice of a bank robbery to be attempted at a certain time, and he with his posse lies in wait until the robbery is actually in progress and shoots down the offenders, is such killing justified?

VERITAS.

Answer: There is no need of rehearsing the principles on which Catholic theology is well established, namely, that the public civil authority has the right to specify the offenses punishable with death and to execute those laws. The public authority has the duty not only to convict and punish offenders but also to prevent the commission of crimes. In the effort to protect the State against desperate criminals some officers of the law have undoubtedly gone beyond the limits of their authority. If they can prevent the commission of a crime, they are not to permit the actual execution of it just for the purpose of giving the criminals a more severe punishment. If the authorities desire to apprehend the criminals in the attempt so as to have proof of the criminal intent and the latter resist arrest, the officers may certainly use force and, if necessary for the protection of their own lives, kill the criminal. To allow the officers more in that case than is necessary for self-protection would be to constitute them judge and jury and executioner, and to give them powers that should not be given to any individual.

DECLARATIONS OF DOGMA BEFORE THE DECLARATION OF INFALLIBILITY

Question: The dogma of the Immaculate Conception and other dogmatic teachings have been defined by the Popes before their infallibility was declared. I have been asked how it is that other dogmas were declared before that of papal infallibility and did not know just what to answer.

READER.

Answer: Our correspondent should have known that the infallibility of the Supreme Head of the Church and of a General Council together with the Supreme Pontiff was always from the beginning of the Church part of the deposit of faith. The universal teaching of the Fathers of the Church and of the theologians as

witnesses of the divine revelation or tradition is considered sufficient to make a certain point of Catholic teaching a matter of Catholic faith. The solemn definition by the Church of a certain point of faith is at times added in confirmation of a truth contained in the divine revelation. In itself the solemn declaration of the Church does and cannot add anything to the revealed truths, as is evident, but merely authoritatively states that a certain point of religious truth is contained in the divine revelation.

RESERVATION BY LOCAL ORDINARIES OF SINS PUNISHED WITH A CENSURE IN THE COMMON LAW

Question: In discussing the cases reserved by the Code and by the Ordinary, the February issue of *The Ecclesiastical Review* (p. 190) states, *contra* Fr. Woywod, that the Ordinary can reserve to himself, *ratione peccati*, a sin for which the common law already inflicts a censure *latæ sententiæ* which is either reserved by that law to the Ordinary himself or is not reserved to anyone. "The Code," declares that *Review*, "does indeed forbid the Ordinaries to reserve either of those cases, but not entirely and absolutely, for it limits that prohibition with the word *regulariter*. In other words, while Ordinaries must not as a rule reserve sins to which the common law attaches a censure either reserved to the Ordinary or reserved to no one, still, if in extraordinary instances they consider it expedient, they may do so."

Answer: A distinction is made in Canon 898 between sins already reserved to the Holy See by reason of a censure and sins punished with a censure that is not reserved to the Holy See. Concerning those sins to which a censure reserved to the Holy See is attached, the prohibition of the Code to all inferior authorities is absolute (*prorsus omnes abstineant*). In the other sins the inferior authorities should not ordinarily make reservations, but indirectly they are allowed to do so in exceptional cases. In the first category of cases the reservation by the inferior authorities is considered null and void by some canonists; in the second class of cases it is committed to the judgment of the inferior authorities to decide whether an exception should be made.

The chief difficulty centers about the sins punished in the Code with a censure reserved to the Ordinary. The general law states that, when a person who has committed a sin to which a reserved

censure is attached is excused from incurring the censure (*e.g.*, bona fide ignorance), the sin is not reserved (cfr. Canon 2246, § 3). Now, if the local Ordinary may make a sin to which the Code attaches a censure reserved to the Ordinary a reserved sin, it is not true that when one is excused from the censure the reservation of the sin ceases. In the censures of the Code not reserved to anyone there is no such conflict. If the common law says the sin is not reserved, the inferior authority cannot say that it is reserved. If then it has been said that we had no authority for asserting that the Ordinary cannot reserve the sins in censures reserved to the Holy See and in censures reserved to the Ordinary by the Code, we believe that the authority for our opinion can be legitimately deduced from the Code itself. We do not claim any certainty for the opinion, but believe that it is a reasonable inference from the Code.

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

CASUS MORALIS

By H. DAVIS, S.J.

Doubtfully Consecrated Hosts

Case.—The following case is not likely to occur exactly as it is stated, but the several parts of it have occurred, and there is no reason why, by a strange coincidence, all the parts should not occur simultaneously. Titius was celebrating Mass at a side altar. As he elevated the Sacred Host, a smaller host, that had somehow attached itself to the larger one as both of them were damp, fell down on to the corporal. Titius had not seen this host before, and had not intended to consecrate it by any actual intention, but under the circumstances he considered it consecrated. Two persons came to the altar rails for Holy Communion. Titius looked around, and to his astonishment saw two hosts on the corporal close to one another, but he did not know which of the two he had set aside as consecrated. He gave both hosts in Holy Communion, since each was probably a consecrated one. On returning to the altar, he observed a small host on the predella. He picked it up and consumed it. On folding the corporal, he found yet another host underneath, and as he considered this to be at least doubtfully consecrated, he conveyed it after Mass to the High Altar on the paten, and placed it in the ciborium containing consecrated hosts. During his thanksgiving his mind was filled with doubts and distractions.

Solution.—There are two remarks to be made so as to elucidate a solution. The first concerns that intention which a priest celebrating Mass should have in respect of consecrating hosts contained in a ciborium or placed on the corporal. There is, it will be remembered, considerable controversy on the case when a ciborium or host is near but not on the corporal during the consecration in the Mass, which the priest had intended to consecrate though he did not advert to the presence of the hosts during consecration.

A few modern theologians maintain that the original actual intention of consecrating these hosts, being virtual at the time of the consecration, is quite sufficient and is effectual, and the hosts not only may but must be considered to be certainly consecrated. No amount of discussion will ever get rid of the fact that this opinion is denied by many of the older theologians, and the reason alleged by them—namely, that no priest may be supposed to wish to violate a grave rubic and to consecrate anything that happens to be off

the corporal—has been submitted to criticism over and over again, but the defenders of the strict view are still unconvinced. These authors maintain that the habitual intention and the general obligation not to consecrate anything off the corporal eliminates beforehand any virtual intention to consecrate what a priest had intended to consecrate. The strict view seems to come to this, that, as a priest, I may intend to consecrate hosts but only on the condition *sine qua non* that they shall be on the corporal at the moment of consecration. There is certainly this much cogency in the strict view, that a virtual intention cannot have more in it than has the actual intention from which it is derived. The actual intention was indeed to consecrate the hosts, but surely not to consecrate them off the corporal. The latter intention, namely, to consecrate hosts off the corporal never existed. If it did not, there can be no virtual intention at all, and therefore no consecration.

Secondly, authors give examples of several good and proper intentions in respect of hosts to be consecrated. That one which commends itself to the present writer—*salvo meliori judicio*—is the intention of consecrating everything that can be consecrated according to the mind of the Church, provided that it is on the corporal or as much on it as is possible in the circumstances. We add this limitation, because, if the corporal is very small and the foot of the ciborium is large, the latter cannot be wholly placed on the corporal. We believe that this intention—which should be renewed from time to time, preferably when the priest is vesting or at the Offertory—should get rid of all reasonable doubt. The priest who is addicted to refining and who is subtle in the matter of intentions will be a poor guide for ordinary folk, not to mention the fact that all such matters are to be dealt with in a human way.

(1) The small host that was attached to the large one must be considered to be consecrated, since Titius consecrated what he was at the moment holding in his hands. We need not assume that he wished to consecrate only the large host which he actually saw with his eyes, and on which alone his attention was concentrated.

(2) When the two persons presented themselves for Holy Communion, Titius acted correctly in giving both hosts, though not on his own principle, provided that his general intention was to consecrate all that had been on the corporal at the moment of consecra-

tion. This we may assume. In the event, however, of an intention to consecrate only what he saw, the second host was not consecrated. In that case, he did wrong in giving both hosts in Holy Communion. He should not have given either, because he could not be certain which of the two was consecrated. He should have treated both as doubtfully consecrated, and should have consumed them himself before the ablutions. The objection that if he consumed the unconsecrated host first he would have violated the ecclesiastical fast, need cause no trouble, for it is not certain that he would have done so.

(3) On returning to the altar, he observed a small host lying on the predella. Though it is highly improbable that this host was ever on the corporal during his Mass, it might, nevertheless, be a host fallen out of a ciborium. Consequently, he did right in consuming it before the ablutions. The case is not improbable, for when a priest removes the veil and cover from a ciborium quickly, a host does sometimes leap out of the ciborium and may fall anywhere. This solution supposes that there had been a consecrated ciborium at the side altar.

(4) A host that is discovered underneath the corporal is not considered consecrated. If, however, the priest was anxious about it, he should consume it before the ablutions, but usually the corporal is folded after they are taken. Titius was quite wrong in putting this host into a ciborium containing consecrated particles, for it would be given in Holy Communion later on. In fact, if Titius himself distributed Holy Communion to the people from that ciborium, he could not be sure that any particular person had received a consecrated host.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUR READERS

A Question That Is Never Answered

Reverend Editors:

Can any of your readers answer this question: "Why is a Catechism which children cannot understand preferable to one they can understand?" Or—what is the same thing—why is it impossible to conduct classes of religious instruction with the assistance of a text-book which the pupils can understand? Why is a Catechism whose questions and answers are simple and clear and intelligible to the average child unpardonably objectionable? When we want a person to understand something, why is it better to tell it in language which has no meaning for him? When we have something to tell a child, which is very important for him to know, why tell it in such a way as to prevent his knowing what we are talking about?

This question is altogether pertinent, because it is just a fact that this is the kind of Catechism everywhere adopted—in the United States, in Canada, in Ireland, England, Scotland, in Australia and New Zealand. The parishes and parochial schools in each and every one of these different countries apparently have accepted the situation as inevitable. It must not be supposed, however, that all have made the same choice. The United States, Canada, Ireland, England and Australia have each a Catechism peculiarly its own. There are just two points in which all five distinctly agree: (a) they are sound in doctrine: (b) they are unintelligible to the pupils for whom they are prescribed. It would seem, therefore, that a proper definition of a Catechism must take this form: "A compendium of Christian Doctrine which learners cannot learn." So fixed and widespread seems to have become this conviction of the necessity of unintelligibility as a first quality in a text-book of religious instruction that children nowhere are allowed to use a Catechism whose questions and answers of themselves convey to them some knowledge of their religion.

For some time I had supposed that I had the explanation of this astounding phenomenon. I suppose we were obliged to use a Catechism children did not understand because nothing else could be had. But upon further enquiry I find several have been produced whose language, terms, and methods of presentation are altogether within the grasp of a young child. Needless to add, they are all sound in doctrine, none of them having been published without the due *Imprimatur*. All of them are accompanied by testimonials highly commendatory from archbishops, bishops, pastors and Catholic teachers. But much as teachers everywhere would prefer them, these text-books are not used in

our schools or Sunday schools—is it because of that one glaring defect, lack of unintelligibility?

Surely, then, there is a pardonable curiosity in endeavoring to ascertain at last the answer to the very comprehensive question: “Why is a Catechism that children cannot understand preferable to one they can understand?” Will any of our parochial school teachers, school supervisors or pastors give us the solution of the problem?

Another question is closely connected with this: since our text-books of religious instruction must be written in a language children cannot understand, why not have them written in Latin or Greek or Hebrew?

M. V. KELLY, C.S.B.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

NEW CIRCUMSCRIPTION OF ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCES AND DIOCESES IN PRUSSIA

Besides the already existing Province of Cologne, there shall be two new ones, Breslau and Paderborn.

Cologne retains the suffragan bishoprics of Treves and Münster, and shall have as new suffragan sees Aachen (a new diocese), Limburg (formerly Suffragan See of Freiburg), Osnabrück (formerly directly subject to the Holy See).

The Archiepiscopal See of Breslau has been assigned as suffragan sees the bishoprics of Berlin (formerly governed by an Apostolic Administrator), Ermland (episcopal see at Frauenburg, formerly directly subject to the Holy See), and the new Prelature *nullius* of Schneidemühl.

The Archbishopric of Paderborn has the Dioceses of Hildesheim (formerly directly subject to the Holy See) and Fulda (formerly suffragan of Freiburg) as suffragan sees (*Motu Proprio*, August 13, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 34).

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE RADIO ADDRESS OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF

The *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, of March 5, reports the radio address which the Holy Father gave last February 12. The simplicity and beauty of the short but ever memorable address, replete with texts from the Holy Scriptures, is most fitting for this epoch-making event.

SEVENTH CENTENARY OF THE DEATH OF ST. ANTHONY OF PADUA

The Holy Father in his letter to the Bishop of Padua expresses great joy over the fact that the two dioceses most concerned in the life of St. Anthony, Lisbon in Portugal where he was born and Padua in Italy where he died, have arranged to celebrate the seventh centenary with becoming religious solemnities. A committee of citizens of Padua will attend the celebrations at Lisbon, and a committee of citizens of Lisbon will take part in the religious manifestations at Padua. The Holy Father speaks at length of the life and

virtues of the Saint known the world over as "the Wonder-worker" (Letter Apostolic, March 1, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 71).

ROSARY INDULGENCES EXTENDED TO THE BYZANTINE-SLAVIC RITE

The Holy See had extended to the Catholics of the Ruthenian Rite the indulgences of the Latin Rite granted for the recitation of the Holy Rosary, and the Catholics of the Byzantine Slavic Rite have requested the same favor. It seems the Hail Mary in the Oriental Rites differs considerably from the Latin, and their manner of announcing the sacred mysteries also differs. These differences would under ordinary circumstances deprive them of the indulgences, which however are now granted to the faithful of these Rites (Sacred Penitentiary, January 31, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 88).

OFFICIAL DECLARATIONS ON THE CODE

(1) *Concerning the Consecration of a Church*.—In virtue of Canon 323 may an abbot *nullius* who does not have episcopal orders validly consecrate a church in another Ordinary's territory with the permission of that Ordinary? Answer: No, he cannot.

(2) *Concerning Substitutes for Choir Duty*.—Do the assistants of canons and beneficiaries come under the name of canons and beneficiaries in Canon 419, § 1? Answer: No, they do not.

(3) *Concerning Diocesan Consultors*.—According to Canon 423 can priests of religious communities and priests secularized from religious organizations be diocesan consultors? Answer: No, they cannot (Committee for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code, January 29, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 110).

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS

His Excellency the Rt. Rev. Joseph O'Sullivan has been appointed Bishop of Charlottetown, Canada. The Very Rev. Joseph Dworzak (Archdiocese of New York) has been appointed Privy Chamberlain to His Holiness. The distinction of Privy Chamberlain of the Cap and Sword has been conferred on Mr. Frederick Thorne-Rider (Diocese of Los Angeles).

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Homiletic Part

Sermon Material for the Month of June

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Frequent Communion

By J. ELLIOT ROSS, PH.D.

"My little children, let us love, not in word nor tongue, but in deed and truth"
(I John, iii. 18).

SYNOPSIS: I. Every age of the Church has its special doctrinal or devotional emphasis.

(1) That of the present age is devotion to Blessed Sacrament, Exemplified in Eucharistic Congresses and Frequent Communion.

(2) Advantages of Frequent Communion.

II. But there are two queries as to this devotion:

(1) Is the devotion of many frequent communicants really as intelligent as it should be?

(A) If it were, should they not be studying Christ's character in the New Testament?

(a) Illustration of young man whose mother died.

(b) Hope that study of New Testament will result from this celebration of Corpus Christi.

(2) Are we showing the results reasonably expected from frequent Communion?

(A) In individual lives, as regards gossip, etc.

(B) Socially, in cities with large proportion of Catholics.

III. By all means communicate frequently—but produce results:
"My little children, etc."

Every age of the Church may be said to have its special doctrinal or devotional emphasis. And there can be no doubt, I think, that the emphasis of the present day is on the Blessed Sacrament. The Feast of Corpus Christi originated in 1246, but no medieval pageant could compare in numbers and magnificence with the Eucharistic Congress of Chicago. Daily Communion for the people was hardly dreamt of at the time of the Protestant Revolt, and there were many priests who did not say Mass every day. Ignatius Loyola was passed by at the altar rail, because the priest thought that he was communicating too frequently. And Ignatius was not by any means singular in waiting several months after his ordination before saying his first Mass.

The custom of Daily Communion in Religious Sisterhoods comes much later than Daily Mass for priests, and can be roughly dated from the Pontificate of Leo XIII. The present widespread practice of very frequent Communion among the laity came into vogue with Pius X. It is well to recall these former conditions, so that we may not take the present situation too much as a matter of course.

Certainly, I believe that the present practice of Frequent Communion is incomparably better than the comparative infrequency of previous ages. I think that Frequent Communion has been a great blessing, and that it should be encouraged. The parish with many frequent communicants is a healthy parish spiritually.

INTELLIGENT DEVOTION

But in spite of my advocacy of Frequent Communion and my realization of its many blessings and advantages, there are two things that trouble me in regard to our people's devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. The first query in my mind regards the object of the devotion. I see people kneeling before the tabernacle with rapt faces, receiving Communion with every appearance of fervor, and supposedly their devotion is to Christ in the Eucharist.

But the test of genuine devotion to Christ which frequent communicants should have is given by Pius X in the Decree of 1905 on Frequent Communion. The purpose of the communicant must not be mere observance of custom, or vanity, or other human reasons, but a sincere wish to please God, to become more closely united to Him by charity, to overcome weaknesses and defects. The grace of the Eucharist makes man more Christ-like. Unlike the food of the body, which is changed into our own substance, this heavenly food transforms man into Christ, bestowing upon the recipient a participation of the character and virtues of Christ. While the Sacraments confer grace of themselves, they demand for their greater fruitfulness an earnest coöperation on the part of those who receive them, and the Pope accordingly requires that, in proportion to his ability, condition and duties, each one prepare himself beforehand for Holy Communion. A remote but very useful preparation for the reception of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament is a devout study of His life, deeds and words as portrayed in the Gospels. If we knew more about the virtues of Our Lord,

we should have far greater devotion in receiving Communion. Let these devout souls, therefore, resolve to read the Gospels. It is a disgrace that Catholics know so little about the Bible, and especially the New Testament. It is Christ we receive in Holy Communion—His Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity. Why not, then, seek to know more about Him from those inspired pages which are a record of His own living words and deeds?

AN EXAMPLE

Sometimes I have put the matter in this way. Let us imagine a young man who had never known his mother, because she died a few months after his birth. However, he professes great affection for his mother, and spends an hour or so each day in a room given over to certain objects his mother used. For long periods he will gaze steadily at her picture. Let us imagine further that his mother, foreseeing her early death, devoted her last months to writing a history of her own life, illustrating her character, and that this record is one of the great literary productions of all time. But her son, in spite of his professed love, has never read these records of his mother. He shows no interest whatever in studying his mother's character in what she went to the trouble to write. Might we not suspect the sincerity of his filial devotion? Might we not think it strange that he is concerned with mere material things?

But is not this fairly analogous to what these weekly and daily communicants are doing, who spend long hours before the Blessed Sacrament, although they will not take the trouble to read the New Testament or the Gospels? Of course, their devotion is to a personality, but is it the personality of Christ as revealed to us, or to some imaginary personality they have created for themselves? Is it being over-captious to wonder why they do not study Christ in the records He Himself inspired, and which they profess to believe are the Word of God?

A LESSON

And so I hope that one of the things that will come out of this celebration of the Feast of Corpus Christi will be a study of the New Testament by all of you. Each of you should have a New

Testament of your own that you can mark up to suit yourselves. Underline certain passages, make notes in the margins and on the fly-leaves, so that you can go back again and again to the most striking facts. Get the character of Christ as depicted in the Gospels fixed indelibly in your minds, and then recall it when you go to Communion.

The second query in my mind is whether we are showing the results reasonably to be expected from Frequent Communion, for Frequent Communion is not only a privilege, it is also a responsibility. There are several checks we can use on this. First, are the good Catholics of the present generation, who go to Communion much more frequently than did their grandparents, really better than their grandparents? Is their family life better, are they more temperate, more self-controlled? Can we say that the good Catholics of today are very notably better than the good Catholics of previous times who received Communion less frequently? If we cannot answer with an emphatic "Yes," are we living up to the test Christ Himself proposed: "By their fruits you shall know them"?

THE TESTIMONY OF OUR LIVES

Undoubtedly, those who receive Communion daily or weekly are not guilty of the grosser sins. They do not commit adultery or get drunk. But do they stand out by their patience, their charity of speech, their freedom from gossip? Can a priest know, for instance, that those who approach the altar every day will not pass on scandals they have heard? Can he be sure that they will not talk about their neighbors? Do daily communicants show less sensitiveness to offense, less jealousy, than those who go only monthly? Again, if we cannot answer affirmatively, are we showing the fruits we should from Frequent Communion?

And, finally, are we showing the results of Frequent Communion where we have large numbers of Catholics massed together? Are those cities where Catholics form a large proportion of the population, and where the parish churches have so many more Communion services relatively than a generation ago, models of good government, conspicuous for the absence of graft, for the cleanness of the stage?

Of course, I do not mean that the frequent communicants among Catholics are the grafters, the racketeers, the gangsters, the purveyors of lasciviousness. But we are to some extent our brothers' keepers. And a large body of frequent communicants ought to be showing results in building up public opinion and in other ways preventing the moral corruption of our big cities. When the cities with a large proportion of Catholics are among the most corrupt in the country, it is only natural to ask if the frequent communicants in these cities are showing reasonable results from their devotion. And it is not a very satisfying answer to say that, if it were not for the frequent communicants, these cities would be even worse.

By all means, then, foster devotion to Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. Encourage weekly and daily Communion. But at the same time make sure that your devotion is genuinely to Christ, and that your Communions do not become routine. Apply Christ's own pragmatic test, "By their fruits you shall know them," and ask yourselves what fruits you are showing.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Sinner and Divine Mercy

By FERDINAND HECKMANN, O.F.M.

"I say to you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance" (Luke, xv. 7).

SYNOPSIS: *Introduction: Sin is permitted by God to happen that He may be able to show the omnipotence of His love and mercy.*

- I. The sanctification of a repentant soul is one of the most glorious acts of the loving, merciful Providence of God. The Angels rejoice at it.*
- II. It demonstrates the value of an immortal soul according to the eternal values.*
- III. Those who consider themselves just and holy often try to hinder the course of Divine grace, love and mercy, like the envious brother of the Prodigal. There are many of this class of men in Christianity and Catholicity.*

Conclusion: The fate of fake-saints and of fake-just and of repentant sinners in eternity.

Our Divine Saviour could not have given us a plainer illustration of the history of the redemption and salvation of mankind

than He has given us in the parable of the Good Shepherd who on his shoulders carries back the lost sheep to the fold. This is the reason, therefore, for the terrible mystery of iniquity, of malice and of sin, that the boundless incomprehensible love and mercy of God might reveal itself. The all-holy, all-powerful God does not permit evil and sin to happen because He is powerless against sin and iniquity, but in order to overcome and vanquish sin and iniquity by the omnipotence of His love and mercy. For without evil and sin God could not have fully demonstrated the overwhelming power of His love and mercy. The oppressive, dark mass of human guilt has also its divinely illumined, glorious aspect—namely, the Redemption.

As often as a repentant sinner returns to His Father's house like the prodigal son in the Gospel, it is as if that part of the earth which we inhabit turned itself again towards the warming, illuminating rays of the sun. Dark night becomes bright day, darkness gives way to light, coldness and frost to warmth and heat, the dark shadows of fear flee before the all-brightening, enlivening rays of the light of day. A soul enslaved by sin and evil spirits, filled with mortal anguish, fear and dread, unable to perform any good work meritorious for eternity, is freed of its slavery, is filled with true joy and happiness, and becomes again fruitful in supernatural merits by means of sanctifying grace. Is there anything more beautiful, more entrancing in nature than a glowing, fiery-red sunrise on a cold, frosty morning? Is there anything more glorious in heaven and on earth than the freeing from sin and guilt—the merciful, full pardoning—of a poor, erring, sinful soul?

THE ANGELS REJOICE AT THE MIRACLE OF FORGIVENESS

When the heavenly spirits, the Guardian Angels to whom the care of the human race is entrusted, witness this miracle of love and mercy, this re-birth of a human soul in grace, rejoicings pervade their ranks, and full of heavenly wonder and joy they sing the same hymn which they sang on the fields of Bethlehem at the birth of the Saviour: "Glory be to God in the highest and on earth peace to men of good will." Then they turn their joyful eyes to the deep, open wounds of the Lamb which pour forth crimson saving love and grace, pure and clear as crystal. They greet with

boughs of palms Him who sitteth at the right hand of the Father of eternal love and mercy and sing: "Hosannah to the Son of David"—as the Jewish people did when He made His solemn, triumphal entry into Jerusalem in order to bring to a bloody consummation the work of the Redemption which fills with joy and happiness heaven and earth for all eternity. St. John says in his Book of Revelations: "And I heard, as it were, the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of great thunders, saying: Alleluia; for the Lord our God the Almighty hath reigned. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give glory to Him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath prepared herself. And it is granted to her that she should clothe herself with fine linen, glittering and white. For the fine linen are the justifications of saints. And he saith to me: Write: Blessed are they that are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith to me: These words of God are true" (Apoc., xix. 6-9). Every repentant soul, newly espoused to her Divine Lover, Jesus Christ, becomes, so to say, His wife, and is clothed by Him with the white, glittering fine linen of the wedding-garment of sanctifying grace, the justification of saints. That is to say, sanctifying grace makes the sinner again just before God, makes him a saint in His sight. When Jesus Christ, like the father of the prodigal son, sees the repentant sinner yet a great way off returning to His Father's house, He is moved with compassion, and running to him falls upon his neck and kisses him. And He says to His servants, the Angels: "Bring forth quickly the first robe and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet; and bring hither the fatted calf and kill it, and let us eat and be merry; because this my son was dead and is come to life again; was lost and is found. And they began to be merry" (Luke, xv. 20-25). Hence, our Divine Saviour says in today's Gospel: "I say to you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance" (Luke, xv. 7). We know that there is eternal, boundless rejoicing among the Angels and Saints in heaven; we know that the just, the Saints, are the cause of infinite joy to God and the Angels; yet, our Divine Saviour tells us that there is more joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance than upon ninety-nine just—ninety-nine saints who need not penance.

THE VALUE OF AN IMMORTAL SOUL

How great, how immeasurably great, is the value of an immortal soul according to the values of eternity! Of greater value, however, than the repentant soul is the grace of God which brought it back to the fold as the shepherd in today's Gospel carried back the sheep on his shoulders to the fold. But of still greater value is He who has merited this grace for the repentant soul, the Redeemer and Saviour, the God-Man, Jesus Christ, the eternal Incarnate Love and Mercy of God. Every truly repentant sinner admits the perversity of his own will and acknowledges the holiness of God. He takes the disgrace of sin upon himself and gives due honor and glory to God. He humbly confesses his helplessness and powerlessness to accomplish his own redemption from sin, and earnestly prays for the assistance of the all-powerful and all-merciful love and grace of God. He removes the hindrance and obstacle of proud self-justification, of self-glorification and self-conceit, and thus prepares the way for Him who comes to seek and to save and to glorify the soul that was lost. The Communion of Saints, the Church triumphant and militant and suffering, celebrate the victorious entry of saving love and grace into the erring soul. God Himself, so to say, celebrates this triumph, because the sanctification of a soul by grace makes again pleasing and lovable in His sight that soul which before was to Him an object of aversion and abomination. "God is love," says St. John (I John, iv. 16). Love, therefore, is God's nature and essence; all His works are love; love is the beginning and end or purpose of all human history and of the history of the salvation of mankind and of every immortal soul.

However, those who consider themselves justified, who are well satisfied with themselves, endeavor to put obstacles in the way of the divine love and mercy. With such as think they need not penance, earthly assertion and glorification of self prevail over the enchanting, rapturous power of the loving, merciful grace of God. They are like rocks in the course of a rapid river against which the foaming waters dash, and over which they noisily skip; they remain unmoved, stable in their fixed state of permanent imperfection. The purifying, sanctifying waters of divine love and grace cannot lift them up and carry them to the ocean of God-like perfection. The waters of divine love and grace pass by and over them

amid the mocking, fiendish sneers and jeers of hell, and despite the sorrowing lamentations which the God-Man uttered over the unyielding, unbelieving, stiff-necked and hard-hearted Scribes and Pharisees.

THE ENVIOUS BROTHER

Such a self-justified, self-satisfied man is portrayed for us by our Divine Saviour in the brother of the prodigal son. He became angry when he approached his father's house and heard the music and dancing in celebration of the prodigal's return and would not go in. He slinks away murmuring, while his father rejoices over the return of the lost son. While the repentant prodigal son begins a new life and enjoys again the pure, sunny atmosphere of the parental home, his brother, who needs not penance, is tortured by anger and envy. And while the father and the whole household sit down at the banquet-table and partake of the fatted calf in honor of the prodigal's return, his brother in his loneliness is consumed by his ever-increasing bitter rancor and grudge.

He was, indeed, always in his father's house, but only as a hired servant, not as a son, a stranger to the heart of his father, ever filled with generous mercy and pardoning love. Perhaps he cultivated carefully the parental fields; perhaps he avoided all unnecessary outlays of money and thus increased the wealth of his father. But he had no share in his father's cares, labors and endeavors for the return of his perverted, erring son; and hence, he could not conceive of the joy at the return of the prodigal. He felt scandalized, as the Scribes and Pharisees in today's Gospel were scandalized when Jesus received publicans and sinners, who drew near unto Him to hear Him. "And the Pharisees and the Scribes murmured, saying: This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them" (Luke, xv. 2).

THE MODERN SCRIBES AND PHARISEES

There are, likewise, in the great family of the Catholic Church not only numerous prodigal sons and daughters who in penance and repentance return to it, but also a still greater number of Scribes and Pharisees, brothers and sisters who are externally correct Christians, but who are internally altogether devoid of the true spirit of Christianity. They are zealous in virtue, they do perhaps

not deviate a hair's breadth from the path of the Commandments of God. Nevertheless, they do not follow in the footsteps of God and of the Saviour. They labor for the external spread of the kingdom of God, but have it not within their own hearts. They are proud of their external Catholicity but they begrudge poor, erring sinners their readmittance into the Communion of Saints. They observe the letter of the law, which killeth, and know nothing of the spirit of the law, which is charity, which giveth life. They know all the important and secondary precepts and prescriptions of Christianity, but the loving force and workings of divine love, grace and mercy in the Church of God are and remain altogether unknown to them. According to them, the care and cure of souls consists in making life a hell for sinners here below, and in making their conversion as difficult and as odious as possible to them. The purest of all Christian joys, the unselfish enthusiasm for the triumph of good over evil, for the victory of saving grace over sin, they never experience. Envy towards those who were perhaps more evil than they themselves ever were, but who perhaps are now better than they themselves are or ever were, consumes their bones. As a rule, they are worse than the worst sinner, for they are lacking in charity, without which, as St. Paul tells us, we are nothing in the sight of God. Instead of being children of God, they are children of the devil, who also is altogether devoid of charity and mercy. Is there, therefore, any cause of wonder that they are continually complaining of the Almighty, that they are ever dissatisfied, that they always feel injured and hurt, because, as they think, their obvious zeal and virtue is not sufficiently recognized and rewarded, and because they would like very much to lay down rules and make prescriptions for the Almighty Father of love and mercy concerning the workings of His love and grace in men.

TRUE CHRISTIAN MERCY

How would Mary Magdalene or the adulterous woman fare if they were brought before the judgment-seat of many of our so-called Christians and Catholics? If they would not flee from them in pharisaical horror and dread of contamination, they would at least mercilessly consign them to an institution that would stigmatize them for life, and thus free themselves of their unholy

presence and remove far from themselves any danger of moral contagion and disease. In His dealings with repentant sinners, the kind, merciful, gentle Saviour never uttered a word of reproach to them, never inflicted any punishment upon them, never even imposed the least penance upon them; His only words to them were: "Go, sin no more." In the parables of the prodigal son and of the lost sheep and goat, He proclaims and teaches the same gentle attitude towards repentant sinners. And He has said to His followers: "I have given you an example, that as I have done to you, so you do also" (John, xiii. 15).

The father of the prodigal son is, no doubt, painfully affected by the brother's envious anger and grudge. "His father therefore, coming out, began to entreat him" (Luke, xv. 28). But he will not listen to any pleadings, and finally the father will leave him to his obstinacy, and will sit down with his returned son and the household to the banquet of love and rejoicing. That is the last terrible act in the life of the self-justified, self-conceited man; that is the last joyful act in the life of the repentant sinner, which will take place in Our Father's house in eternity. "Judge not," says the Saviour in His great Sermon upon the Mount, which contains the essence of His teaching, of His religion, "that you may not be judged. For with what judgment you judge, you shall be judged; and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again" (Matt., vii. 1, 2). "Judgment without mercy to him that hath not done mercy" to his fellow-men, says St. James (ii. 13). Should not this give us food for thought?

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Word of God

By P. M. NORTHCOTE

"And it came to pass that . . . the multitudes pressed upon Him to hear the Word of God" (Luke, v. 1).

SYNOPSIS: *I. Man by nature religious.*

II. Jesus the revealer of God to man.

III. Christ's Word endures.

IV. Peter's boat.

V. The office of St. Peter's successor.

VI. Relation of the sheep to their Shepherd.

VII. Conclusion.

That men in general are naturally inclined to religion is so patent a fact that it requires no proving. There is no nation so barbarous or degraded as to be absolutely devoid of religion, howsoever debased its religion may be. The individual atheist is an abnormality, an atheistic people is a thing unknown. This universal fact, in itself a testimony of the strongest kind to the existence of a Deity, arises from the very constitution of human nature. We are endowed with an intelligence which stretches out towards the universal and the limitless; man never rests content with the knowledge already acquired, but forever seeks to extend the boundaries of knowledge, the hunger of the mind for truth being insatiable. Our will, that faculty which is the necessary concomitant of intelligence, is of like tendency, and its propulsion is towards happiness without limit and without end, permanent and unalloyed. Since, then, we cannot be satisfied with anything short of the infinite and eternal, there is only one Being who can satisfy the craving of man's nature, and that is the Infinite Being who created us for Himself. "The Lord made all things for Himself" (Prov., xvi. 4), and He could not do otherwise, for He alone existed and could therefore only constitute Himself as the ultimate end of all that He created. Everything that He created is designed to give Him glory in accordance with the nature He gave to it, and thus sub-human creation by fulfilling the laws of its being serves Him blindly without merit or demerit. Man is different, for he is intelligent and free, and consequently must render to God a service intelligent and free in accordance with the nature God gave him. Had man not been raised to the supernatural state and had he remained in his natural integrity, his reward would have been a knowledge and possession of God far surpassing anything we can conceive in this world; yet, it would still have been in the natural order, and it would have sufficed him, for he would not have known of anything else or thought anything else possible, and no one aspires to the unknown and the impossible.

But God has done much more for man. He has raised him to a supernatural state and gives to him by the working of the Holy Spirit a supernatural impulsion towards Himself, for the means must be proportioned to the end; and the end He has deigned to constitute for man is an end for which not the natural powers of

the highest Archangel are adequate, being nothing less than the Beatific Vision of His unveiled Face, an "entrance into the joy of His Lord," a share in God's own essential beatitude.

We see, then, that the words of the Psalmist are a cry both natural and supernatural proceeding from the heart of man: "My soul hath thirsted for the strong living God" (Ps. xli. 3).

JESUS THE REVEALER OF GOD TO MAN

So the multitudes pressed round Jesus to hear Him. They did not as yet realize that His words were the human utterance of the Eternal Word, for they had not as yet come to the knowledge of who He was. They came in response to a mysterious drawing, an inward sense for which they could assign no reason that He and He alone could satisfy the needs of their soul, that He alone could fill that aching void which is in the heart of every man. It is the same with ourselves; above all reason, more cogent than any Christian evidences, is that inward something which tells us that Christ alone is the goal of the mind's quest after truth and the heart's insatiable craving for love. "No man comes to the Father but through Him" (John, xiv. 6). "He is the way, the truth and the life" (*ibid.*). It is a supernatural impulse, "the Spirit giving testimony to our spirit that we are the sons of God, heirs with God, and co-heirs with Christ" (Rom., viii. 16, 17)—the final and clinching argument immediately preceding the gift of faith.

CHRIST'S WORD ENDURES

Our Lord has said that His Word should not pass away. If His revelation were liable to human corruptions, it could be of but little value to mankind in general; it might profit His immediate hearers, but He willed that His audience should be as wide as the world through all the centuries to come. In this Gospel we have a striking symbolical illustration of the means He would devise to maintain His revelation intact to the end of time.

PETER'S BOAT

As you skirt the northern extremity of the Sea of Galilee from Bethsaida to Capernaum, when you have gone about a mile you will espy a tiny bay enclosed by grass-covered slopes. No tradition

attaches to the spot, but it immediately arrests the eye suggesting the scene narrated in this Gospel: we can imagine seated on the grassy banks the eager crowd and in the center of the bay the boat with the divine figure of the Redeemer standing in the prow, His voice wafted to the listening throng on the still, warm air. The boat is Peter's; I fail to see how it is possible for anyone to read the New Testament without being at once struck by the intimate association between Christ and His chosen Apostle, and the marked preëminence of his position among the rest. It would be needless to quote again the hackneyed passages in which Christ gives the reason of His change of Simon's name to Peter, for that he is the rock on which Christ builds His Church and to whom He commits the keys thereof (Matt., xvi. 18, 19), or where He makes him the confirmer of his brethren's faith (Luke, xxii. 31, 32), or constitutes him supreme shepherd over His whole flock (John, xxi. 15-17). But certain it is that Christ's words to Peter—indeed, the whole trend of His very special relation to this one selected so unmistakably for a unique position in the scheme of His Kingdom—have given rise to the Papacy, and further Christ must have foreseen that it was quite inevitable that they should give rise to the Papacy, the only possible inference being that they were intended to give rise to the Papacy.

THE OFFICE OF ST. PETER'S SUCCESSOR

All, therefore, upon whom the mantle of Peter falls are the vicegerents of Jesus Christ for the governance of His Kingdom; in any matter of dispute which may arise in the Church of God they are the ultimate court of appeal. What has rendered the constitution of such a final authority absolutely necessary in the Church is precisely the preservation of the faith taught by Jesus. We see in it the fulfillment of His promise that His word should not pass away. No gathering of the universal episcopate, no formation of a select committee, could have achieved this end; authority concentrated in a single person is the only way by which unity could be preserved in a matter so vital as the Faith. That such an authority has been constituted by Christ in Peter and his successors cannot be denied by anyone who reads with attention the

Books of the New Testament, unless his mental vision has been obscured by pride or preconceived prejudice.

RELATION OF THE SHEEP TO THEIR SHEPHERD

If there be rule, there must be subjection, for authority and obedience are correlatives. Since, then, Christ has placed Peter to represent Himself as shepherd of His flock, it is incumbent on ourselves, His sheep, to render a loyal and loving obedience to our appointed shepherd, and especially I would emphasize the absolute and unquestioning acceptance of every dogma of faith or conduct on which the final authority in the Church has set his seal. Without this we are not Catholics at all, and it is precisely this which makes the essential difference between Catholics and all sects whatsoever: they follow their own imaginations, we follow the voice of our Shepherd. For in listening to Christ's accredited spokesman we listen to Christ Himself: "He that heareth you heareth Me" (Luke, x. 16). It is the voice which comes from Peter's boat, which is the voice of "the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls" (I Pet., ii. 25), and His sheep know His voice (John, x. 4). We are scorned for this, because we surrender our intellect to the acceptance of truths beyond our comprehension, and it is looked upon by those outside as a degradation of the human understanding. Most unreasonably, however; for, once convinced that God has spoken and that He has entrusted His message to an authority ordained by Himself, it would be sheer inconsistency—nay, patent folly—did we not hearken. After all, the vastly greatest proportion of the knowledge that each one of us possesses is based upon the foundation of human testimony, and there is comparatively very little of the things we know that we have or could test for ourselves. All past history, almost all current events, most of our knowledge of the earth's surface—on what does it all rest if not on human testimony? Even in the exact sciences we are for the most part content to accept without demur the conclusions of experts, being incompetent to make the necessary deductions for ourselves. But, says St. John, "if we receive the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater" (I John, v. 9). Assuredly, once we are convinced that the message is from God, doubt is no longer possible. This is wholly in keeping with God's dealings with us

We have said that we are called upon to serve God according to the nature, intelligent and free, He has given us. If, then, He demands of us the homage of our will by obedience to His moral law, is it not to be expected that He will demand of man the homage of his noblest faculty, the intellect, by the "obedience of faith" (Rom., xvi. 26)?

CONCLUSION

Happy are we to be thus "taught of God" (John, vi. 45). When we look around us and see the incessant wrangling of the sects that have separated themselves from Peter; when we behold the shifting and uncertain nature of human opinion; when we see the last remnants of faith fast disappearing and Christian morality more and more disregarded; when men calling themselves ministers of Christ openly deny such cardinal truths as the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, and the very Divinity of the Incarnate Word, it is very difficult not to suspect that such men would clearly profess themselves unbelievers, were it not for the lure of position and emolument. We can but pity the poor dupes of these hireling shepherds, and turn with the grand old Galilean fisherman to Christ, saying with him: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John, vi. 69).

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Charity

By FRANCIS BLACKWELL, O.S.B., M.A.

"Be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, being lovers of the brotherhood" (I Peter, iii. 8).

SYNOPSIS: *Introduction: St. Peter wrote for certain Christians of his own day these words which now, through the pages of Holy Scripture, he addresses to us all. What, then, is to be our bond of union? Charity.*

- I. (1) *What is charity?*
 (2) *Charity is a supernatural virtue. Why?*
 (3) *Charity is divided into habitual and actual.*
- II. (1) *Character of charity towards God.*
 (2) *Character of charity towards ourselves.*
 (3) *Character of charity towards our neighbor.*

Conclusion: St. Peter urges us to exercise charity and St. Paul emphasizes its importance.

My dear brethren, those words, addressed to certain Christians of his own day, St. Peter now addresses to us all through the pages of Holy Scripture. But, if we are to be of one mind, we must have some bond of union to make our minds one. What shall our bond be? Is faith enough to unite us? No; over and above faith we need charity, if we are to be "lovers of the brotherhood."

Yet, charity is based on faith. It is built upon our belief in God. For what is charity? Is it mere kindness to others because we like them? No, indeed; we can have charity, and we must have it, whether we like our neighbor or not. We must love him, even though we cannot bring ourselves to like him. Still, often the practice of charity towards our neighbor leads to our not only loving him but liking him also. To love is to wish good to the one we love; and so it may come about that, wishing our neighbor to enjoy the good we already see in him, besides any further good that may accrue to him, we are drawn on in spite of ourselves to like him. But charity is a much wider thing than the love of our neighbor, though it includes that love.

WHAT CHARITY IS

Charity is the love of God for His own sake, and of our neighbor as ourselves for God's sake. Now, charity is not natural. If it were, we should love only those we liked among our fellow-men. Charity is supernatural. Why? Because its source, object and end are supernatural. The man who helps the poor simply because he enjoys being bountiful, or because he likes the particular persons he helps, or because the sight of misery gives him pain, does not exercise charity. His act is merely natural; virtuous, perhaps, but an act of natural virtue. Such an act merits a natural reward, but no supernatural reward in heaven. For it has for its object one's neighbor viewed from a natural standpoint, and for its end that neighbor's and one's own natural happiness. Charity, on the other hand, is supernatural in its source, object and end. It is also supernatural in its motive.

The source of charity is the grace of God, without which we can love God, indeed, as our Creator and Benefactor, but we cannot love Him as a Father who has adopted us as His children. Charity has for its object God, ourselves and our neighbor, viewed from

the standpoint of faith. For its end charity aims at our eternal salvation; and our eternal salvation consists in seeing God and loving Him with that same love wherewith He loves Himself. The motive of charity is God, who is regarded as infinitely good in Himself and infinitely worthy of our love; while all else is considered as worthy of our love on His account.

Charity is habitual and actual. Habitual charity is that abiding state or condition of charity, which "is poured forth in our hearts," as St. Paul says, "by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us" (Rom., v. 5). Actual charity is this habit or aptitude for charity which is given us in Baptism and, if lost, restored by the Sacrament of Penance; actual charity is this capacity for charity when put into practice.

CHARACTER OF CHARITY TOWARDS GOD

The love of God, brethren, is our attachment to God as our sovereign good and last end. We may love Him with either the love of *affection* or the love of *desire*. If we love Him with the love of affection, we love Him for *His* own sake, because He is infinitely good and infinitely worthy of our love. This kind of love is perfect charity. If we love Him with the love of desire, then we love Him for *our* own sake, whether for the blessings we have already received from Him or those we hope to receive.

Our love of God must be supreme. That is to say, we must love Him above all things. We can love God above all things in one or other of two ways. Our charity is supreme in its *appreciation*, if we esteem God above everything and prefer Him to all; or it is supreme in its *intensity*, when it gives rise in our soul to a tenderness of affection beyond all other tenderness. Of these two kinds of love of God, one is absolutely required of us, appreciative love; for this we can always have through the grace of God. And we can know that we love God, at least appreciatively, above all things, if we know that we keep His commandments.

CHARACTER OF CHARITY TOWARDS OURSELVES

Not only, brethren, is charity the love of God, but it is also the love of ourselves and of our neighbor for God's sake. The love

we owe ourselves, besides having this sacred character of being a love for God's sake, must also be a just love—not one borne towards ourselves at the undue and unfair expense of our neighbor's rights. We must love ourselves, too, not solely for worldly gain or pleasure, but in all things for our true and eternal good. If our love for self be an inordinate one, we can overcome it through the practice of self-renunciation. This practice implies an unceasing warfare against concupiscence. In this strife we resist pride by obedience to authority; voluptuousness by denying ourselves unlawful pleasures; and covetousness by detaching our hearts from the goods of this world.

CHARACTER OF CHARITY TOWARDS OUR NEIGHBOR

By our neighbor, dear brethren, we mean all those who are capable of enjoying eternal happiness or who already possess it; that is to say, all men on earth, the souls in purgatory, and the Angels and Saints in heaven.

We are obliged to love our neighbor. When, tempting Him, a lawyer asked Our Lord which was "the great commandment in the law," Jesus indeed answered him: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind." He affirmed that that was the greatest and the first commandment, but He hastened to add: "And the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments," said He, "dependeth the whole law and the prophets" (Matt., xxii. 35-40). We cannot, therefore, love God without loving our neighbor, since Jesus Christ has declared that the commandment which bids us love our neighbor is of like importance to that very commandment which bids us love God Himself.

Though we are bidden to love our neighbor as ourselves, we are not thereby required to have equal charity towards our neighbor as towards ourselves—still less, greater charity; but we are required to have love for our neighbor as we have love for ourselves. We owe love to our neighbor as to ourselves, because he, too, has been created to the image and likeness of God, redeemed by the Most Precious Blood of Jesus Christ, and is destined, like us, to eternal happiness.

THE EXERCISE OF CHARITY

Love of our neighbor, dear brethren, lays duties towards him upon each one of us, duties of both a negative and positive character. If we must not do to others what we would not have them do to us, we must also do unto others as we would that they should do to ourselves.

St. Peter bids us be "all of one mind, having compassion one of another, being lovers of the brotherhood" (I Peter, iii. 8); and St. Paul—after that memorable passage which begins: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels"—draws our attention to the three theological virtues of faith, hope and charity, and then lays it down most emphatically that "the greatest of these is charity" (I Cor., xiii. 13).

Book Reviews

SOME NEW WORKS ON THE BIBLE

The study of words—of their origin, history, meanings, and the like—is very interesting and fruitful, especially when pursued methodically and with a definite purpose. Such study is also necessary for certain classes of people. Students for example, and professional men in particular, must have their dictionaries and special lexicons; and to a Scripture specialist or a theologian a Bible lexicon is not only very interesting but a real necessity. We are reminded and further convinced of this truth by the appearance of the second edition of the Greek Lexicon for the New Testament in the Cornely *Cursus Sacra Scripturæ*.¹ It will be a delight for the exegist to turn to this volume and read there a complete record of every term employed by the Evangelists and Apostolic writers. If he wishes to know the age of a word, the Lexicon will tell him whether it belongs to ancient or to later Greek; if he desires to learn its literary standing, he will be told whether it is classical or popular; if he seeks information about its use and frequency, the book will indicate whether it is a Septuagint or a New Testament expression, whether it is found in the New Testament alone or elsewhere as well, and so on. The theologian will also be glad to have this volume, for it gives special attention to words of greater theological import, explaining many of the more difficult passages and referring to the ancient versions for a better understanding of doubtful texts. As might be expected, this second edition of so invaluable a work is superior to its predecessor of twenty years ago. It has new material, which enlarges the book about 100 pages; it takes account of the New Testament editions of von Soden and Vogels and of recent works on the Hellenistic language, and uses an improved method of reference.

Another important achievement of the authors of the *Cursus* was the issuance some months ago (October, 1930) of their Commentary on the Book of Tobias.² Biblical critics in recent times have given much attention to this Book, and it is well known that attacks have been made on all sides upon the defenders of Tobitic historicity. Fr. Galdos does not despise the researches and studies made by modern critics and the evidence of archeology and documents; but, on the other hand, he is not carried away by the theories based on them which

¹ *Lexicon Græcum Novi Testamenti*. By Francis Xorell, S.J. 2nd ed. Carefully revised (P. Lethielleux, Paris).

² *Commentarius in Librum Tobit*. By Romuald Galdos, S.J. (P. Lethielleux, Paris).

are unfavorable to the Book of Tobias. An impartial and thorough study both of the book, of the historical data, and of the critics and their criticism is made with the result that the traditional view is seen to be upheld rather than weakened by the sciences. The Commentary has three parts: an Introduction, an Exegetical Section, and Appendices and Indices.

Less diffuse than the *Cursus Sacrae Scripturae* is the work entitled *Prælectiones Biblicæ*, of Frs. Simon and Prado. A fourth edition of its New Testament Commentaries³ has appeared recently (October, 1930), its Introduction to the Bible is in press, and its two volumes on the Old Testament are announced for the near future. This work has been highly praised for solidity, clearness and erudition; and these qualities, along with its comparative brevity, make it very suitable for those who have not the time for longer or more specialized studies.

Very much like Gospel Commentaries are the scientific and apologetic Lives of Christ which have appeared in recent times as an answer to the rationalistic or naturalistic biographies of the Saviour, which either depart entirely from the history as handed down by the Evangelists, or else give it a purely human coloring. Among the most recent of the scientific Lives is that of Père Grandmaison, S.J.⁴ This work, the product of a life-long study, was completed in January, 1927, just five months before the author's premature death. The first volume, which appeared in an English translation in June, 1930, prepares the way for the real history of Christ by a study of the sources of that history, whether Christian or non-Christian. It first takes up the references made to Christ in Jewish and Roman writers of the early centuries, and then passes on to apocryphal and canonical writings. Naturally, the Epistles of St. Paul are included among these canonical sources, since from them alone a short life of Christ could easily be compiled. In the next place, the author explains the historical setting in which the life of the Saviour must be placed—that is, the political, social, intellectual, and religious conditions of first-century Palestine, without an understanding of which one cannot read the Gospel narrative intelligently. It is a highly instructive work, and we shall eagerly await the rest of it in English dress.

It is hardly necessary to remark that all such Scriptural studies are preëminently useful for the clergy of all ranks. The scholar needs them for his writing and teaching, and the priest engaged in the ministry not less so, for they disclose the meaning and power of the sacred

³ *Prælectiones Biblicæ ad Usus Scholarum*. By Hadrian Simon, C.S.S.R., S.S.L. *Novum Testamentum*. Vol. I-II. Fourth Edition Revised by J. Prado, C.S.S.R., S.S.L. (P. Marietti, Turin).

⁴ *Jesus Christ. His Person, His Message, His Credentials*. By Leonce de Grandmaison, S.J. Volume I (The Macmillan Co., New York City). In our issues of March and April, 1930, Don Ernest Graf, O.S.B., furnishes an extended appreciation of the original French edition of this work.

text and thus become invaluable aids to doctrine and devotion. We must not forget that one of St. Paul's last recommendations to preachers and pastors was the study of the Sacred Writings, the Holy Scriptures, which are profitable to teach, reprove, correct, and instruct and which equip those who read and study them for their work, rendering them men of God and successful pastors and directors of souls.

C. J. CALLAN, O.P.

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY

The complaint that Scholastic philosophy is embalmed in manuals that have been left untouched by the progress in the art of book-making, and that it is for the most part couched in a terminology which is not only unintelligible to the modern reader but moreover grates unpleasantly on his ear, is beginning to lose its pertinency. A breath of spring is sweeping over the desert field and clothing it with rich verdure. Quite recently several Scholastic texts have appeared that have shaken the dust from their pages and that compare very favorably with the best specimens of the modern art of textbook making. It is the privilege of the reviewer to bring two of these to the notice of the readers.

Modern speculation has unquestionably overemphasized the problem of knowledge, but, be that as it may, we must meet our adversaries on the ground on which they take their stand. As a result of this situation epistemology now bulks very large in Scholastic theory. In no department is modernization more imperative, since we must not be content to prove to ourselves the validity of knowledge but must make every effort to bring this basic truth home to the modern mind. We think that Dr. Barron in his recent text has chosen the right approach.¹ His departure from the conventional treatment requires no justification. We need not stereotype the traditional methods of presentation. Newness of exposition has a stimulating effect and is rather desirable. Though the book is elementary in scope, it covers the entire field and certainly meets the needs of the student, who in its pages will find everything he ought to know about modern trends in epistemology. Against sensism, pragmatism, humanism and the various forms of modern realism the author defends the claims of truth. His criticism of false or inadequate systems is uncompromising but sympathetic. It goes without saying that he subscribes to the system of moderate realism, which satisfactorily accounts for the origin of our knowledge and at the same time fully guarantees its validity. The volume constitutes a valuable addition to our philosophical literature and is sure to make many friends.

¹ *Elements of Epistemology*. By Joseph Thomas Barron, S.T.D. (The Macmillan Co., New York City).

Seminary students will find it very helpful as collateral reading in connection with their Latin manual.

Some of our Catholic educators are inclined to overestimate the contribution which modern psychological research has made to the cause of education. Without sufficient discernment they adopt new methods which are vaunted as being superior to the traditional ones. They are afraid of not being fully abreast of modern progress. What they need is a really critical study of modern educational psychology, which will make them realize that, though there is much in this science which commends itself to our judgment, there also is much that will not stand criticism. Such a discriminating text we have in the translation of Father De La Vaissière's excellent work on pedagogical psychology.² Here is an author who, though quite hospitable to well-established results of scientific research, yet preserves a judicial attitude towards the extravagant claims so often put forth by the modern laboratory psychologist. He does not lose himself in the maze of detail because he is guided by the light of rational psychology. A thorough study of this succinct treatise on educational psychology will help our educators to select wisely from the many things which modern psychological investigation would thrust upon them. Undoubtedly there is much we can learn that will improve our educational methods, but caution and reserve very often are in order. The translation has been well done and reads easily. Since our English literature is not rich in this type of book, the translator has by the translation of the scholarly work rendered a great service to his confrères.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

² *Educational Psychology*. By Jules De La Vaissière, S.J. Authorized Translation from the Fifth French Edition by S. A. Raemers, M.A., Ph.D. (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

THE BOOK OF RUTH

Dr. Grimmelsman, the young professor of Old Testament Exegesis at the Cincinnati Seminary, Ohio, is already widely known for his exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus. His second notable contribution to Catholic Biblical science, "The Book of Ruth,"¹ merits the highest commendation for its scholarly attainment. Ruth, the Moabitess, is one of the few women so singularly privileged to have her name incorporated in the genealogy of Christ (Matt., i. 5).

The eye of the reader is immediately greeted at the very beginning by a rich selected bibliography. Catholic authors and periodicals are naturally not neglected, but are most diligently chosen and used through-

¹ *The Book of Ruth*. By Henry J. Grimmelsman, S.T.D. (Scott, Foreman & Co., Chicago, Ill.).

out the entire work. In the Introduction (pp. 7-31) the author not only gives the historical background for this story, but at the same time offers a very brief introductory course in the physical geography of Palestine, with an orographic and hydrographic description of the land. This with the archeology, including the customs of the Hebrews relative to marriage and harvesting, renders the text more intelligible to the reader. The identification of Segor with a site at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea (p. 24) seems less probable (cfr. *THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW*, December, 1930, pp. 290-293).

In his excellent commentary on the text (pp. 32-65), the author strives to give us the best literal translation and meaning. The typical sense sometimes proposed by the Patristic writers is not ignored. Wherever the M T needs emendation, he carefully compares this with the Greek, Vulgate and Peschitto versions. He was also so fortunate as to see personally verified many of the customs mentioned in the book. Though primarily intended for the students of high schools and colleges, this book can also be profitably employed in the Seminary Hebrew class, serving as a faithful guide, translation and commentary to the text of Jouon.

JOHN E. STEINMUELLER, S.T.D., S.S.L.

THE REMEDY FOR ECONOMIC ILLS

No prophetic vision is required to foresee an outbreak of social unrest and discontent on a large scale in the near future. All indications point towards just such a contingency. Again the present economic system and social order will be subjected to severe criticism and a demand for radical change will arise. The important matter is to meet the indictment of the present order and the inevitable utopian schemes of reform that will be put forth with a sane criticism of abuses that really exist and with a feasible program of social reconstruction. Both of these must be based on a careful, honest and comprehensive study of human relations and social laws.

"Man and Society"¹ presents an analysis of society that will enable the reader to approach intelligently the social problems which challenge the ingenuity as well as the good will of the men of our times. To build up a new social edifice we must first dig down to bedrock and make sure of a sound foundation that will carry the superstructure. No plan of reconstruction that fails to take into account the real nature of man and the purpose of social organization can be of permanent value. The most essential thing is a philosophy of human society. That is what we find in these pages.

One of the prime functions of a philosophy of human society is to

¹ *Man and Society. An Introduction to Sociology.* By Francis J. Haas, Ph.D. (The Century Company, New York City).

strike a satisfactory balance between the rights of the individual and the rights of society. This is a very delicate problem, and modern philosophy is unable to propose an adequate solution. It either blurs the rights of the individual in favor of the authority of organized society, or overstresses these rights to the detriment of society. The outcome in either case is fatal. Catholic philosophy avoids these extremes and gives to the individual what belongs to the individual without taking from society what belongs to society. The author of the work under review takes his stand squarely on Catholic principles. The introductory chapters, in which he treats of the origin of man and the dignity of human personality, are basic, since they give definite orientation to all his speculations on the nature of human association. In the hands of many, the science of economics has become an impersonal science that deals with things and processes and entirely disregards the human factor. The author leaves us in no doubt about this matter: to him man is central. Where this vital assumption is made, social science takes on a moral complexion and furnishes a basis for the proper treatment of the intricate questions of social justice. It may be laid down as a law that all our social wrongs and ills result from a disregard of human dignity. This frank assertion of human dignity, by which the author prefaces his study of society, contrasts happily with the manner of those sociologists who begin by belittling man and reducing him to the level of the brute. It also accounts for the ethical tone that prevails throughout the treatise and the human sympathy that is so pleasingly in evidence.

Against this background are sketched the meaning and functions of the various social bodies of which man finds himself a member. The domestic society and the State, as their importance demands, are discussed with great fullness of detail. In this connection the modern errors concerning the origin of the family and civil society are refuted. Society is described as a distinctly human phenomenon, and not as a gradual evolution from animal gregariousness. The author is principally concerned with the rational aspect of the process of association and hence gives but little attention to the non-rational factors entering into it. For his purpose—namely, to give an ethical interpretation of social policies and to supply a groundwork for the right appreciation of social problems—this analysis is adequate, though it might be supplemented if he had set himself the task of writing a text of theoretical sociology. In his definition of the duty of the State in the province of economics the author follows closely the lines laid down in the *Encyclical of Leo XIII*. The discussion of the problem of wages is penned with great warmth; it reflects a passion for social justice and a deep sympathy for the laboring classes. We would naturally expect this from the antecedents of Dr. Haas, who has been prominently identified

with the labor movement and taken active part in various endeavors aiming at the social betterment of the wage earner.

So far the work has been considered chiefly as it would interest the priest, who in our days of social agitation cannot keep himself aloof from the social movement, and who is called upon to take in it a leading part. The book will be for him a reliable source of pertinent information and a safe guide in his social activities. It is, however, primarily intended as a manual for class use, and forms part of the Century Catholic College Texts edited by John A. Lapp. It answers this purpose well, and embodies all the features which we expect in an up-to-date text of this type. The questions appended to each chapter are stimulating and the numerous references will encourage further study. The Index covers the entire range of the topics treated, and will be of great help to the casual inquirer.

Less ambitious but for all that not less useful is an excellent little volume which we owe to the pen of Father John A. McClorey, S.J. It deals with that dangerous menace which is now threatening the peace of the world and the continuance of our Western civilization.² The reader has guessed that reference is being made to the new social system which has arisen in Russia and is reaching out to conquer the world. Bolshevism is a power that must be faced and combatted. Father McClorey supplies the intellectual weapons that can be effectively used in this battle thrust upon the civilized world, and especially on the Catholic Church. But the author does not merely condemn Bolshevism; he also points out the flaws in our own system and offers many constructive suggestions. Courageously he scourges the sins and vices of our times which have brought this nemesis upon us. Abundant material for sermons and lectures is contained in the handy volume.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

² *The Catholic Church and Bolshevism*. Seven Lectures by the Rev. John A. McClorey, S. J. (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

FOR THE PAMPHLET RACK

Two new pamphlets from the Paulist Press have reached us. *Baptism*, by Rev. Francis Connell, C.S.S.R., lucidly explains the meaning, institution, necessity, minister, recipient, effects and ceremonies of this initial rite. *Christmas, The Gift of God*, by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., sets forth the philosophy of belief and of denial, of Christian joy and pagan pleasure, that are evoked by this central fact of history and cornerstone of our faith.

A Way to End the Leakage, a two-penny pamphlet by the Rev. J. Leycester King, S.J., published by the Catholic Truth Society (38-40, Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1), is the most important received in

some time, and it merits some detailed remarks. It evidences the leakage from the Church, shows a method by which it was completely if locally stopped for twelve years, and pleads for national action along similar lines. It is written for England, today a land of militant Catholicism, and, if the situation there evokes such comment and effort, surely the pamphlet will be acceptable in America where the struggle to preserve the Faith has not been so keen. We may summarize the author's remarks. It is an unpopular and unpalatable truth that the Catholic body is sickly and greatly unfitted for its mighty task. Of three million Catholics in England only two-thirds perform their Easter duty. We make heavy sacrifices to secure Catholic education, but once our children leave school there is an almost complete lack of organized effort for them. The author concludes by way of contrast that the very way of the world shames us beyond measure.

For good reasons which he cites he concentrates on stopping the leakage among working boys. Parish social organizations for merely material purposes without relation to the spiritual life are of slight value. The Sodality of Our Lady is the means he uses. Such a spiritual society easily brings necessary finances, zealous coöperation and friends for the social amenities organized in subordination to it. No rigid rules are laid down, but this exposition of a *modus operandi* that really worked in an industrial town with 5,000 Catholics contains ideas that are so simple and practical that they startle us. He features the prefect system or lay council or governing body, personal follow-ups for missed Holy Communions, monthly talks by priests and laymen, and yearly retreats. At the age of sixteen the boys are transferred to the Men's Sodality with its club opportunities. Persistence and the loyal coöperation of educated laymen who have had—not their indifference but—their excessive diffidence overcome, have brought the success.

The pamphlet is carefully written by a "sociologist" and shepherd of souls. It is no destructive or pessimistic cry of woe. But it calls indeed, though not explicitly, for a renewal and a spread of the spirit of Blessed Don Bosco. It reminds us of our own Fr. Mereto's recent pamphlet on our failure to give religious instruction to so many of our Catholic school children, which called forth so much comment—and, we hope, stirred many both to will and to accomplish.

A Child's Life of St. Thomas Aquinas (B-302) presents in exceptionally readable and interesting form edifying circumstances both traditional and less well known. B-301 is *A Child's Life of Blessed Thomas More*, who said: "A man can live for the next world, but be merry withal." Meg his daughter, "the ornament of Britain," into whose lap her father's head was tossed, also figures in a tale replete

with repartee and touching coincidence. Teresa Lloyd is the author of both perennially interesting stories which sell at one pence.

Two fascinating stories of others of the English martyrs are *Blessed John Southworth* (B-305), by Rev. J. L. Whitfield, and *The Martyr Monk of Manchester, Blessed Ambrose Barlow, O.S.B.*, (B-303), by Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B. Their lives of successive imprisonments and reprieves end with touching accounts of their deaths at Tyburn. There is wealth of inspiration in these homely but glorious descriptions of days so near our own. Thus, hearing the dread details of execution, one could say: "All this is but one death"; while a despoiled chapel has the inscription: "Transit gloria mundi, fides Catholica manet."

Renunciation (F-293), by Alice L. Oxley, is the story of two unusual vocations. *Broad Meadows* (F-294), by G. H. Stevenson, is the story of a family made Protestant through fines and of a descendant returned to the Faith. *Mary Clare* (F-295), by the same author, tells of the loss of faith by an Irish girl in England through mixed marriage, and of its recovery through her priest brother. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius* (D-296), arranged in prayers, is a welcome primer of spirituality.

All these pamphlets come from the Catholic Truth Society, and sell for twopence.

JOHN K. SHARP.

AN ARMFUL OF BOOKS

Maria of Padua, One of St. Therese's Little Legion, with an introduction by Benedict Williamson (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.), is an interesting account of the Filippetto girl who lived in Italy from 1912 to 1927. She formed her spiritual life on the life of the Saint of Lisieux, whose ardent desires spread from a convent cell throughout the whole universe. Maria's strong natural personality was gradually spiritualized by effort and by suffering till she resembled the heroic spirit of St. Agnes. A list of cures attributed to the holy child's intercession after death and a number of her letters complete the volume.

Terry Donovan, by Gerald Kelly, S.J. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee), is an unusually interesting juvenile in which the hero's struggles and achievements at a Catholic boarding school are realistically portrayed.

In *God's Jester* (Benziger Brothers, New York City) Mrs. George Newman tells the story of the life and martyrdom of Father Michael Pro, S.J., murdered by the Calles Government in 1927. And this account of a man and martyr, a humorist and ascetic of our own day is as gripping as the story of a martyr in any age. Perhaps it most resembles that of a Douai priest in Elizabethan England. The story is told against a revealing background of unhappy Mexico—a part of Latin America "which tourists nearly always ingore, and which has seldom been 'shot' by an American film com-

pany." Whatever be said of the state of religion in such lands, the fact that in the three recent years of persecution thousands died fighting for it and 167 priests were put to death, shows that it is still a very vital thing. A measure of peace, secured largely by a minority of Catholics in worldwide agitation and despite the indifference both of our own Government and of many Catholics, reigns there now. Even so the persecution doubtless brought forth a more virile Catholicism. "The blood of martyrs is the seed of Christianity."

A Friend of Mine, by David P. McAstocker, S. J. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.), must surely go a long way towards fulfilling its purpose of bringing the soul to think of its Friend, personal, prayerful, suffering and strong, when brightness has vanished and mists have crept about, and it finds itself in darkness. Parables, simple tales, and examples from modern business, the classics and the Gospel reveal the author's cultured mind, wide reading and keen observation. Its fresh and unique points of view make it a delightful book, as entrancing as a novel. It is for all religiously minded persons.

In her new novel, *Italian Adventure* (Longmans, Green and Co., New York City), Isabel C. Clarke's theme is absorbing and delightful. It tells of a young and attractive English woman thrown from a wrecked automobile and found injured outside the gates of Prince Aldo Delfino's villa near Milan. She is taken into the villa and given the expert care of his otherwise disagreeable aunt, Lady Quain. All she recalls is her marriage to a man named Nim, an unhappy memory. They call her Elaine. Clues to her identity are sought in vain until Father Sinclair recognizes her as Mrs. Brent whom he knew in England. Convinced finally that she is, she returns and learns of her husband's death. Then the Prince travels to England where love and happiness follow. The characters ring true in the courteous, kind and self-willed Prince, the graceful and charming Elaine and the intolerant and domineering Lady Quain. The scenes are laid about beautiful Sant' Ilario. The story is well told and sustains the interest.

Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement, by Rev. E. Cahill, S.J. (M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin), grew out of articles published some years ago in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. It has had a large sale, and within a few months of its appearance a new edition was called for. Father Cahill has read very widely on his subject, using both Masonic and non-Masonic sources, as his bibliography shows. A priest or layman who wishes to get a correct idea of Freemasonry—what it is not as well as what it is, its teaching, organization, membership, methods, its relation to various other secret organizations or social associations—cannot do better than to purchase this volume. Written documents and spoken declarations of the sect are used as sources for the author's statements, and the various Papal condemnations of Freemasonry are also quoted. One who reads this work cannot fail to understand why the Church must be opposed to the Masonic and other like societies.

The Essence of the Catholic, from the German of Fr. Peter Lippert, S.J. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York City), is a translation of three lectures

delivered to Catholic students at Heidelberg in September, 1922. By the essence of the Catholic the author means "the spiritual and personal individuality of the Catholic . . . the ideal man in whom Catholicism is embodied in all its fullness, in all its wealth and depth." No such man exists in reality, since even the most exemplary Catholic falls far short of a perfect fulfillment of his religion. But the best Catholic is one who is most influenced by the Catholic standard of values, and who tries most earnestly to reproduce Catholic principles in his own life. The Catholic character will express itself in a particular way in the individual, but, in spite of the immense number of personal types, there is a common element stamped on all which can be discerned and described. What this common element is which every Catholic man should aspire to as his ideal, the author explains in his three talks on the Faith of the Catholic, the Will of the Catholic, and the Soul of the Catholic.

The Homiletic and Pastoral Review

Vol. XXXI

JUNE, 1931

No. 9

PASTORALIA

Pastoral Theology

Considering as we do the seminary course not in an abstract or general way but with special reference to the problem of convert-making, none of the subjects taught in the Seminary will be of greater interest to us than that of Pastoral Theology. Direct training for the work of converting our fellow-men belongs according to our view to this theological discipline. If there is to be a course in the art of convert-making (and such a course we deem eminently desirable), it can be organically connected with this department of seminary studies. The reasons for this are manifold.

Pastoral Theology is a practical science and concerns itself with the various concrete duties of the pastoral office. Its function is to apply theoretical principles to the actual conditions of everyday existence. It constitutes the natural bridge between the academic atmosphere of the lecture hall and the arena of life. It opens the windows of the classroom and gives the student an outlook upon the wide fields of life. Here the narrow horizon of Scholastic theory is transcended and contact with reality effected. Since the purpose of the seminary is predominantly practical, it stands to reason that training in Pastoral Theology should hold a foremost and highly honored place in the curriculum. Unfortunately it does not always receive the attention to which it is entitled. In some seminaries it leads a veritable Cinderella existence and is accorded but scant recognition. That accounts for the disparaging manner in which this important branch of studies is occasionally referred to by priests and students, who are not inclined to esteem very highly the benefits which it confers. Yet, if rightly conducted, the class of Pastoral Theology will be of inestimable value to the young priest, save him from much wasteful groping, prevent deplorable

blunders, and immeasurably increase his efficiency in the ministry, for it acquaints him beforehand with the problems that crop up in the discharge of the sacerdotal duties and shows the ways in which they may be successfully handled. Intellectual training does not fit one to meet life; some practical preparation is also necessary. Pastoral Theology supplements the academic studies on the practical side. It is here that the student learns what he is to do with the variegated information he has acquired. As it is, it sometimes happens that the young priest in later life does not know what to do with the knowledge he has been compelled to accumulate during his seminary career. He, therefore, frequently laments the fact that he was constrained to waste so much time in learning useless things, and as a consequence missed so many other things that would be helpful. This is not an uncommon complaint, and its frequency and manifest sincerity would indicate that it is not entirely without foundation. This challenge is met by Pastoral Theology, which is in a position to show the applicability of the seminary studies to the needs of the ministry, since it focuses these studies and imparts to them their practical orientation. It is not difficult to see how important this directive function is, and how it vitalizes and correlates the isolated studies of the seminary course. Without exaggeration, therefore, it may be claimed that all seminary subjects converge in Pastoral Theology, and that this latter science represents the crowning point of seminary training.

We are neither overstating the importance of Pastoral Theology nor exaggerating the extent to which it is sometimes neglected. We have excellent authority for our contentions. A quotation from Dr. A. M. Micheletti fully bears out what we have been saying: "*Theologia pastoralis tamquam necessarium theologiæ complementum moralis haberi debet, quod utique in pluribus seminariis male deficere videmus. Ex ea enim tantum ars illa artium quæ regimen animarum suscipiendum docet rite constare poterit, ac sapientes industrias quibus in vinea Domini, ubere cum fructu, est adlaborandum ediscere est.*"¹ Surely, we cannot think or speak lightly of a science that teaches the supreme art of saving souls and tells us how to cultivate the vineyard of the Lord so that it may yield abundant fruit.

¹ "*De Ratione Studiorum in Sacris Seminariis*" (Rome).

If Pastoral Theology is a discipline of such comprehensive scope and vital importance, it logically follows that the qualifications of the teacher of this branch of learning must be of a high order. As a matter of fact, to measure up to the exacting requirements of his task he must not only be well versed in all the theological sciences but also possess practical experience in pastoral work. If he lacks one or the other, his teaching cannot be very fruitful. It is futile to exalt theory at the expense of experience or to belittle theory in favor of experience; both must be harmoniously blended in him who wishes to teach us the art of dealing with life. In our case, however, many would be inclined to emphasize experience to the detriment of theoretical knowledge. These we would remind of the fact that experience without theory remains blind and moves within extremely narrow circles. On the whole, empirical knowledge is less reliable than speculative thought. Experience, if not subjected to severe intellectual criticism, can result in even greater absurdity than abstract logic. The so-called experienced and practical man is often blind to the patent shortcomings of the technique which he has developed.² Hence, the teacher of Pastoral Theology must draw from the fountain of theory as well as from that of experience. Let him study the book of life but not neglect that of science.

We again appeal to our authority in this matter, Dr. Micheletti, who sets very, very high standards for the teacher of Pastoral Theology and expects him to be a man of mature judgment and sound scholarship. "Quum autem," he writes, "indoles huius artis rerum praxi et experientia contineatur, patet illi dicendæ præficiendos esse tantum sacerdotes ætate ac morum prudentia graves, in scientia et pastoralis regiminis usu apprime versatos, qui, ex bono thesauro suo, quæ docenda præferant, ac vias quibus ad cor hominum facilius patet aditis probe noverint."³ To which we venture

² With good reason Goethe says: "Grau, teurer Freund, ist alle Theorie, Und grün des Lebens goldner Baum" (Faust). But we must not forget that experience unenlightened by theory may prove very misleading and remains very fragmentary. We quote Herbart, who censures those who attempt to build up an educational system merely on the data of their own experience: "How far, however, this may or may not be true, each man decides from his own experience—I from mine, others from theirs. Only let us all consider the proposition—each but experiences what he attempts. A nonagenarian village schoolmaster has the experience of his ninety years' routine course; he has the consciousness of his long toils, but has he also the criticism of his work and his methods?" (The Science of Education.)

■ *Op. cit.*

to add: "Quite so, a man of maturity, yet not one who lives merely in the past and is out of harmony with his own times.

The chief reason, perhaps, why Pastoral Theology is regarded with but scant respect, and why rather inadequate provision for its teaching has been made in seminaries, is the fact that only of late has it risen to the dignity of a science. It is even now in a backward state. Up to a comparatively recent date it was little more than a hodge-podge of unrelated or loosely connected topics that could not well be fitted elsewhere into the organism of seminary studies, and that therefore were relegated to this new science which as yet commanded over no rigidly defined territory and had to accept whatever was allotted to it by its fully accredited sister sciences. But it is now achieving the status of a recognized theological discipline, and will no longer have to live by the sufferance of the other sciences. It will map out for itself a definite province and find a subject-matter of sufficiently specific kind so that there will be no need to encroach on the legitimate sphere of cognate disciplines. Of course, overlapping occurs in other sciences and is almost inevitable, but in Pastoral Theology this trespassing on foreign territory was a common offense. To this vicious trait of the old Pastoral Theology Dr. Micheletti refers when he says: "Eo porro ad rectam sacramentorum administrationem, atque ad ea omnia quæ Pastorum practica officia spectant coarctanda sunt, ne (ut sæpius contingit) finitimas sibi provincias (quas v. g. morum ac dogmatum theologiæ, ius canonicum, sociologia ac regiminis scientia recte occupant) invadat exturbetque."⁴ As our science gradually acquires systematic structure and develops a scientific method adapted to its purpose, it will outgrow the faults that marked the stage of evolution.⁵

⁴ *Op. cit.*

⁵ Pastoral treatises have existed from the earliest days of Christianity, and we would not think of minimizing their value and usefulness. Our sentiments are identical with those which Bishop John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S.B., so beautifully expresses in the following passage: "The *Regula Pastoralis* of St. Gregory the Great is not a book that is out of date. . . . What is required in the training of priests is to combine the wisdom of the Fathers with the clear perception of present day needs. No instruction or exhortation addressed to candidates for the sacred ministry will be sure or safe, if it is not grounded upon the Catholic tradition" (*Lex Levitarum*, Westminster). Still, however useful for the guidance of the priest in his activities and duties a collection of rules for the proper discharge of the pastoral ministry may be, it cannot claim the quality of a science. Pastoral Theology has now gone beyond this stage. It not only arranges its practical rules in systematic order, but also deduces them from general theoretical

This development comes in response to a growing need. The pastoral ministry in our days has become more complex, and as a consequence scientific direction for the discharge of the duties which it involves is an urgent necessity. What has been written on the subject must be cast into scientific mold and adapted to the changed conditions of our own days. Where formerly zeal, enthusiasm and pastoral prudence were sufficient, scientific formation and technical equipment are now indispensable. Hence the increased importance of Pastoral Theology and also the demand for its systematic and scientific elaboration.⁶

THE CENTRAL THEME OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY

Though Pastoral Theology devotes much time to problems of parish management and the administration of the pastoral office, this is not its central theme. These matters are external, and partake very much of a business nature. They belong to the routine of the pastoral life. No doubt it is helpful to develop a technique for the right performance of these routine duties, but such tasks do not constitute the heart of the priestly office, and by the same token do not form the main object of the science of the priestly office. We have no difficulty in formulating this object, which will give to the science its distinctive character.

Pastoral Theology is the science of the care of souls. This definition at once places our discipline in a category of its own, and likewise can be made to embrace all the matters that fall within its scope. It does not exclude the externals to which reference has been made, since they are directed to this very purpose. In fact, the parish itself and the pastoral ministry exist for no other end than to facilitate the care of souls.

The science which studies the nature of the care of souls, and

principles. This is an advantage over the pre-scientific stage since the norms for the administration of the pastoral office are thus stated with greater precision and seen in their relation to and dependence on higher truths. Perhaps the most successful attempt to invest Pastoral Theology with a scientific character and form is that of Dr. Cornelius Krieg ("Wissenschaft der Seelenleitung. Eine Pastoraltheologie in vier Büchern," St. Louis, Mo.).

⁶ The social environment cannot but affect the life of the parish and may create specific problems that have to be met in new ways. The vast changes brought about by industry and urban concentration have had this very effect, and Pastoral Theology must devise means to deal with the situation. With perfect justice, therefore, Dr. Krieg says: "Das Studium der pastoraltheologischen Wissenschaft, zumal der specieller Seelenführung, ist heute notwendiger denn je" (*op. cit.*).

in a systematic way formulates the laws that insure, foster and perfect this sacred service, cannot ignore anything pertaining to the priestly office. Without putting any undue strain on the meaning of terms, we can therefore easily accommodate within the purview of this sacred discipline whatever the Seminary can do by way of preparing the young Levite directly for the work of convert-making. We say directly, for the preparation which the psychological and apologetical training gives is of a general and remote nature.

We have, then, found a place in the seminary curriculum for this course in convert-making which ought to be a part of the equipment of every young priest in our days. The business is no longer everybody's, and therefore nobody's business. The responsibility is definitely fixed. The other studies provide the material, but in Pastoral Theology it receives unity and form. The many threads are gathered and woven into a consistent pattern. The point where Pastoral Theology makes contact with the art of convert-making is that section which deals with the individualized care of souls. The care of souls is exercised in various manners according to the needs of the souls whom the pastor serves. The pastor ministers to the sick, to sinners, to those striving for higher perfection, to those whose spiritual welfare is especially jeopardized, and to the dying. He will also minister to the erring, to the infidel, and to the unchurched, for these also stand in need of the spiritual ministry. In all these different cases the care of souls which he exercises will have to be specialized. It is the function of Pastoral Theology to teach the candidate for the priesthood how the care of souls can be adapted to these varying needs. Fittingly it will also instruct him how those who are not of the Fold may be won for the true faith.

WIDER CONCEPT OF THE PASTORAL MINISTRY

To minds of legalistic turn this line of argument will not appeal. They will object that the pastoral ministry has very definite connotations, and that it is naturally restricted to the members of the parish. The pastoral relation extends to a designated people, constituting a legal and moral entity of which only the faithful can be regarded as parts. Moreover, the care of souls is exercised by social contacts of an authoritative nature which exist only in an

established social body. For these reasons convert-making does not come under the pastoral office, and is not an objective of the pastoral cure of souls. If this is the case, the preparation for this work cannot be legitimately brought under the jurisdiction of Pastoral Theology.

Though we are strongly tempted to remark that this is spinning the wool rather fine, the objection cannot be brushed aside as irrelevant. It has the letter in its favor. It is true that the letter killeth, and in this case the letter would kill and stifle something infinitely precious and glorious, namely, the missionary spirit. Yet, the letter also has its rights.

We admit, therefore, that a strictly literal interpretation of the pastoral ministry would narrow it to the faithful and exclude from it all obligations to those not incorporated in the organism of the parish. Such a literal construction we repudiate, and put in its place a more liberal conception. For this there is sufficient warrant in the priestly office. If the pastoral relation is confined to the members of the parish, the priesthood knows no such limitations. But the pastor is first and foremost not merely the administrator of an organized parish but a priest, and as a priest he belongs to and is obligated to all men. The narrow point of view that would allow the pastor to become completely absorbed in his parish, taken in the legal sense, savors of that ugly mentality which we designate as institutionalism. The spirit of institutionalism is foreign to the Catholic priesthood.

We can approach the objection in another way. The hierarchy and the clergy exist in and for the Church, but inherent in them remains the original mission of the Apostles, which was to all men. The apostleship cannot be dissociated from the priesthood, and accordingly the pastor is more than a dispenser of the mysteries of God to the faithful; he is also an apostle. Yes, he is commissioned to govern an established parish, but he is also sent into that particular territory as an apostle, as a missionary. Adapting a phrase from Shakespeare we might say: "The quality of the priesthood is not strained." It possesses an essential universality which the law orders but does not destroy. Inasmuch, then, as the pastoral ministry participates in the apostolic mission, it extends also to those who are not of the Fold, and convert-making comes well and legiti-

mately within its range. St. Jerome lends authority to our view when he describes the office of the Apostles in these terms: "Consideratur autem hic ordo præcipuus: Jussit apostolos, ut primum docerent universas gentes, deinde fidei intingerent sacramento et post fidem ac baptismum, quæ essent observanda præciperent."⁷ This fundamental apostolic mission is never obliterated. It remains in the bishop, it remains in the pastor, it must find its expression in the pastoral activity.

The pastor who feels justified in limiting the care of souls to the members of his flock reminds us unpleasantly of the parable of the Good Samaritan. Priest and Levite passed by this unfortunate man, who had fallen into the hands of the robbers and had been stripped and wounded. They left him in his misery and helplessness. What was it that made these men so unresponsive to the needs of a fellow-man? Surely, they were not naturally of a callous disposition. But there was something that checked their spontaneous human sympathy. It was the institutionalism into which Judaism had degenerated and hardened. Along our path we can find many unfortunate souls that have fallen into the hands of robbers and been stripped and wounded. They need the spiritual physician. They sorely require spiritual nursing. Would it be possible for us to relinquish them to their sad lot and to deprive them of the benefits of the care of souls? It is impossible for us to think of a pastor who would not be a Good Samaritan to the victims of error and unbelief.

If, then, we take a larger view of the pastoral ministry to make it include the care for the souls of non-Catholics, we think that we arrive at this view, not by a perversion or distortion, but rather by a natural expansion of its original idea and purpose.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

⁷ *Comment, in Matt. xxviii.*

THE SCOLDING PREACHER

By THE RIGHT REV. MSGR. H. T. HENRY, Litt.D.

Do "scolding" preachers still exist? Or do they exist in sufficiently noteworthy numbers to justify an article dealing with them under such a forbidding title as the one that heads this paper? I do not know. They have existed, however, as the present paper may prove; and if they do not exist any longer, we can congratulate ourselves, as a clerical body, on the immunity we enjoy today.

As a comprehensive and illuminating text let me quote the words of Father Stang's "Pastoral Theology": "Never scold nor speak in anger; rather praise on every lawful opportunity. It does not require much skill or any extraordinary talent to scold people or use harsh language for the purpose of correcting them." Like many another wise counsel, this one commends itself in the simplicity of its words and in the justness of their import, but may nevertheless be hard to put in practice effectually and habitually.

I

There have been occasional scoldings which are logically laughable, as when a preacher assails absentees from his preaching. They are not able to hear his invectives, but those who are piously present must appear to bear the brunt of a scolding, which clearly they do not deserve. And meanwhile there may be no word of commendation for those who are present.

This latter fact is commented upon in the interesting volume on "English Preachers and Preaching (1640-1670)." The author speaks of certain preachers, and continues: "These genuinely good and faithful and hard-working and often suffering preachers always feel that they are generously giving of their knowledge and experience, as in truth they are. But one wonders why there is no word from them of commendation for those who come to listen, only reproof for those who stay away. It must have been very inconvenient for working people to attend so many, and such long, sermons; it cannot always have been interesting material that was presented. Yet, the congregations seem unfailing even at what

would appear to be a difficult hour for an assembly to convene" (page 38).

This comment should lead us to ask ourselves: how often do we compliment our congregations on their attendance at a time like the present, with its innumerable attractions outside of church? On the other hand, how often do we complain of those who are absent as though we are assailing those who are present?

I have said that such a complaint is logically laughable. Great Saints seem to be happy-minded folk, and I am not surprised that St. Francis de Sales, for instance, found it possible to make humorous comment in the case of a certain learned preacher who labored hard at his sermons but nevertheless failed to attract many to hear him. It happened that the Saint was present at one of the sermons in which the preacher devoted most of his time to finding fault with the absentees and concluded with a threat to cease his preaching labors unless he had a larger attendance. On leaving the church, St. Francis remarked to a friend: "What does the good man mean? He has been lecturing us for a fault we at any rate cannot have committed, for we were present! Did he wish us to cut ourselves up so as to fill more places? His scolding will not do much good to the absent persons who did not hear it. If he wants to get hold of them, he should go out into the highways and byways and press them to come to his banquet. As it is, he pursues the innocent and lets the guilty go scot free."

The preacher could have couched his thought in gentler forms. He could first of all have complimented his hearers on their laudable desire to hear the Word of God, and have urged them to ask their friends to do likewise, because there is an apostolate of the laity which can and should be exercised. For we are, in a true sense, our brothers' keepers, and God will reward us for a judicious effort in such an important matter. But mere complaining will seem open to a suspicion that the preacher feels personally affronted at small congregations, when his learned labors deserve better acknowledgement in a crowded church.

There is, again, a peculiar side to preaching as a message from God to men, which the complaining preacher may easily overlook. "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." He removes the "woe" if he preaches the Gospel; and, in so far as possible, he acquits him-

self of a bounden duty. What really does it matter to him, in that divine office he fills, whether many or few hear him? There may even be better fruit gained from a small than from a large auditory. This was the view of St. Francis de Sales.

The Bishop of Belley tells us of a remark made to him by the Saint: "You may be glad if, on ascending the pulpit, you see only a few people present." The bishop was surprised at this, and objected that it is no more trouble to preach to many than to only a few people. The Saint rejoined that an experience of thirty years in preaching showed him that he always got better results from preaching to small than to large congregations. There was one occasion, in particular, when he found only seven persons in church on a certain rainy Sunday. Somebody suggested to him that it was not worth the trouble to speak to such a small body of people. He replied that a large congregation did not stimulate him, nor a small one depress him. If his sermon did some good to only one person, he was satisfied. He accordingly preached simply, briefly, and without special pathos, on devotion to the Saints. One person in the congregation began presently to sigh and weep and finally to sob loudly. The Saint, fearing the man was ill, paused and asked if he could give some help. The man said he was not ill, and begged the Saint to go on preaching. At the end of the sermon, the man threw himself at the feet of the Saint, exclaiming: "M. le Prévôt, you have saved my soul; you have given me a new life; blessed be the hour in which I came to hear you—it will be my blessing throughout 'eternity!'" Protestant ministers had persuaded him that Catholics paid idolatrous worship to the Saints, and had caused him to renounce the Catholic Faith. The brief sermon he had now heard decided him to remain faithful to the Church. "I cannot tell you," said St. Francis to the Bishop, "what a good impression this incident made in that part of the country, or how many persons were helped by it to the truth. I could tell you many similar facts, all of them tending to make me so much prefer small congregations that, when I go into the pulpit, I am always glad to find only a few hearers before me."¹

¹ St. Francis may well have had in mind the words of St. Chrysostom, with which the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore concludes the chapter on preaching in its *Acta et Decreta*: "Ne autem, quia non potes orbem terrarum servare, paucos despicias; neque ex magnorum desiderio a minoribus te abstrahas. Si

We forthwith recall the sermon preached by Our Saviour to an auditory consisting of one woman at Jacob's Well in Samaria. St. Bernardine of Siena "never refused to discuss spiritual matters with any one who demanded his help, when he would always suit his words to the needs of each particular soul, and show as much zeal for the salvation of one fellow-creature as for the conversion of a whole population" (Thureau-Dangin, "Saint Bernardine of Siena," page 49). The complaining preacher may hereupon further complain that, of course, he is always willing to give any amount of instruction to a single person who asks for it, and that the cases of the Samaritan woman and of the person who might ask spiritual help from St. Bernardine are not at all the case of a preacher speaking to a small congregation. But what is really the difference? We plant and water, but it is God who giveth the increase. And thirty years of experience in preaching is a fairly ample time on which to base the generalization of St. Francis that he preferred small congregations to large ones.

The Catholic priest has, therefore, two sound reasons for avoiding "the scolding" sermon because of poor attendance. There is the human reason, namely, that it is logically laughable to inveigh to those who come against those who stay away. And there is the divine reason, namely, that, if we do our bounden duty, the comparatively small congregation may give us better results from our sermon than a much larger one, for it is always God who giveth the increase.²

II

Father Stang's warning, which I have used as a sort of text,

centum non potueris, decem cures; si denos non possis, ne quinos spernas; si quinos non possis, ne unum despicias; si unum non potueris, neque sic animo deficias, nec quæ penes te sunt cohibeas."

² I omit consideration of "money talks" from the pulpit, partly because they do not pretend to be sermons, but announcements; and partly because they are by no means logically laughable contentions like the scolding of absentees. We are, nevertheless, warned by conciliar enactments to make such talks rather seldom. Our necessities may prompt us, however, to put too much vim into our voice and diction, whereas an occasional true sermon on the necessity under which the laity lie to support pastoral work and the unpleasant need of collecting moneys under which the clergy are placed might stimulate the people to give more justly. "Generously" is the word ordinarily employed, instead of "justly"—and doubtless experience shows that "generous" is the more diplomatic word to use. If so, we find even here that praise is better than blame. The famous *mot* of St. Francis seems to apply in this case, that more flies are attracted by a spoonful of molasses than by a barrel of vinegar (or words to that effect).

comprises two sentences. I have now discussed the first sentence, and must go on to the second: "It does not require much skill or any extraordinary talent to scold people or use harsh language for the purpose of correcting them."

In the English translation (entitled "*Directorium Sacerdotale*") of Father Valuy's "*Directoire du Prêtre*," I find similar warning: "Nothing is so easy, and nothing so hazardous, as thundering against vice and declaiming against sinners. It is incomparably more difficult, and incomparably more useful, to give well-reasoned instructions and solid homilies. Try to ground moral lessons on the dogmatic teaching of the Church. Consult the Scriptures, the Fathers, the teachings of experience: do not hesitate to put under requisition what you find of use in printed courses of sermons and ascetical works. Never launch out into a personal attack, least of all against any person of influence, for you would provoke without correcting. Distrust those bursts of eloquence hatched during a night which indignation has made sleepless; but rely upon those which are the offspring of a fervent and prolonged visit to the Blessed Sacrament."

It would appear to be helpful for any priest who contemplates making a necessary attack on the evils in his parish to write down in black and white just what he wishes to say, to put that sermon away for several weeks in his desk, and then to read it slowly and critically in the light of the advice I have just quoted. Our danger manifestly is scolding "right off the bat," improvising both ideas and words in which to clothe them. Father Valuy's counsel to prepare such a sermon as an instruction, in which we give well-reasoned conclusions supported by Scripture, the Fathers, the teachings of experience, borrowing thoughts and even words wheresoever we find them in courses of sermons or in ascetical works, is excellent. If we strive to do this, we shall indirectly find our anger cooling and the prerogatives of right reason gradually asserting themselves.

III

Father Stang warns us against the use of "harsh" language. Father Valuy speaks of "thundering against vice." Father De Ravignan makes a distinction. Speaking to young clerics, he says: "There is a danger, too, of being hard, harsh, and reproachful.

Be severe from time to time, but never harsh: mark this well . . . let nothing but love prompt even your severity. Rather give comfort and encourage. Fill yourselves with the spirit of mercy. But in God's name, I beg you, let there be no softness, no effeminacy, no sham sensibility, nothing sentimental. I know what I am saying. I speak to you as a father. If any one's character of preaching lead him to sweetness, it is a valuable quality and an earnest of success; but even sweetness must be tempered by the prudent admixture of firmness." Thus Ponlevoy quotes the wonderfully successful conférencier of Notre Dame when, towards the end of his career, he addresses the young Jesuits placed under his homiletic care.

The extremes to be avoided are thus apparently, on the one hand, the harsh scolding style and, on the other, namby-pamby pussy-footing. Gentleness (or "sweetness") is to be combined with firmness. Father Faber's "Conferences on Kindness" will show us a way out. There is "sweetness" everywhere in his various ascetical works, but there is throughout them all a solid piety based on the Gospels and on approved ascetical authorities.

There seems to be a common view among the writers I have quoted here that our people need encouragement rather than strong condemnation. The fact that our churches are filled at every Mass on days of obligation would appear to support this view. The testimony of our confessionals and communion rails adds support to the contention that our people are striving to keep the laws of God and of the Church. The great sinners can best be attended to in mission activities, although here too a kindly attitude combined with a clear statement of moral truths will achieve better results ordinarily than wholesale denunciation.³

³ I say this under very possible correction from wiser and more experienced heads. My own experience is limited to the Forty Hours' Devotion, which is not quite the same, I judge, as the occasional Mission, in respect either to the sermons or to the auditory. *Initium sapientiæ timor Domini*, and "Love casteth out fear"—the two declarations are not insociable, of course; and it is the experienced missionary who best knows the proportionate emphasis to be placed on either or on both for the amendment of life in the case of sinners who have long neglected their duties.

I. EVOLUTION: AN ALLY OF RELIGION

By JOHN A. O'BRIEN, Ph.D.

The function of the philosopher is not to controvert the findings of modern science but to interpret their bearing upon the problems that lie within the field of ultimate causes which is the domain of philosophy. He is not qualified to dispute the correctness of the data supplied by natural science. That problem must always remain within the realm of the scientist. Assuming the data of the scientist to be properly verified, the philosopher undertakes to answer the resultant question: "What of it? What are the implications of these findings upon our concepts of the intelligibility of nature, of the rational organization of the universe and of the Supreme Intelligence behind it?"

Let us proceed then to interpret the philosophical implications of evolution. Does evolution lessen the teleological character of the universe? Does it nullify the concept of design and purpose in nature? Does it minimize in any way the need for a guiding Intelligence behind the administration of the universe and the operation of its laws? Does it remove God from the universe and substitute in His stead the forces of chance variation, environment and natural selection as sufficient of themselves to explain the origin and development of all forms of life upon the earth?

That evolution leads to such conclusions is the construction placed upon its philosophical implications by a school of writers of whom Haeckel stands as a symbol. Evolution is regarded as the agency guiding the adaptation of living organisms to changing environments, responsible for the development of new species, and hence is vaguely apotheosized as the fountain of causal energy which stands in need of no ulterior agent to account for it. The operation of this law or force is sufficient to explain the whole universe, inorganic and organic, from the time when it was an original gaseous nebula to its present state of development. It is obvious that in drawing such conclusions Haeckel and his followers have gone beyond the boundary of science and are in the disparate domain of philosophy where the test tube and scales are no longer the symbols of conquest.

EVOLUTION OFFERS NO BASIS FOR MATERIALISM

This proclivity on the part of some scientists to use evolution ■■

a basis for the philosophy of materialism has been the source of much confusion and error. As that distinguished scientist, Dr. Joseph Le Conte, for many years Professor of Natural History at the University of California, pointed out back in 1911:

"The truth is, there is no such necessary connection between evolution and materialism as is imagined by some. There is no difference in this respect between evolution and any other law of Nature. In evolution, it is true, the last barrier is broken down, and the whole domain of nature is now subject to law; but it is only *the last*; the march of science has been in the same direction all the time. In a word, evolution is not only not identical with materialism, but, to the deep thinker, it has not added a feather's weight to its probability or reasonableness. Evolution is one thing and materialism is quite another. The one is an established law of nature, the other an unwarranted and hasty inference from that law.

"Let no one imagine, as he is conducted by the materialistic scientist in the paths of evolution from the inorganic to the organic, from the organic to the animate, from the animate to the rational and moral, until he lands, as it seems to him, logically and inevitably in universal materialism—let no such one imagine that he has walked all the way in the domain of science. He has stepped across the boundary into the domain of philosophy. But, on account of the strong tendency to materialism and the skillful guidance of his leaders, there seems to be no such boundary; he does not distinguish between the inductions of science and the inferences of a shallow philosophy; the whole is accredited to science, and the final conclusion seems to carry with it all the certainty which belongs to scientific results. The fact that these materialistic conclusions are reached by some of the foremost scientists of the present day adds nothing to their probability. In a question of science, viz., the law of evolution, their authority is deservedly high, but in a question of philosophy, viz., materialism, it is far otherwise. If the pure scientists smile when theological philosophers, unacquainted with the methods of science, undertake to dogmatize on the subject of evolution, they must pardon the philosophers if they also smile when the pure scientists imagine that they can at once solve questions in philosophy which have agitated the human mind from the earliest times."¹

¹ Joseph Le Conte, "Evolution, Its Nature, Its Evidences, and Its Relation to Religious Thought" (D. Appleton and Company, New York City, 1911), pp. 286-7.

The scientist who remains within his own jurisdiction views evolution as a method, a process in nature. He investigates the causo-mechanics of the process, appraising the influence of such factors as heredity, chance variation, environment and natural selection. These are, however, but the immediate *instrumental* causes. The problem of the ultimate cause which has given to such factors their efficacy and has infused into them the laws by which they operate, remains untouched. This fact is recognized by the eminent scientist, Professor Edwin G. Conklin of Princeton University, who observes: "*Evolution deals only with process, and does not touch the question of ultimate causation.* What lies back of evolution no one knows. The atheist sees only mechanism and accident, without design or purpose. The theist sees back of the whole process divine power and plan. The Christian sees a heavenly Father. Science cannot deal with this mystery; it is a matter of faith alone; but it is plain that Christian faith gives the largest value to human life and the greatest stimulus and comfort."²

The philosopher insists upon penetrating beyond the web of external circumstance, behind the surface of immediate instrumental causes, to the ultimate cause. Evolution is but the description of an orderly progressive ascent from the lowest form of living organism to the highest. What is the directive force behind the process? Conflicting answers to this question are given by the two main schools of philosophic thought, materialism and theism. The materialistic, holding as its cardinal principle that there is nothing in the universe but matter and energy, answers that the whole process of evolution is explicable in terms of the interaction of matter and its forces.

WHENCE COMES PURPOSE?

Unsatisfied with this facile ready-made solution of the problem, the theist asks: "What about the evidence of design, plan and purpose in the organization of the universe?" Does not the skillful adaptation of means to attain a definite end, which the scientist sees especially in the development of new organs to meet changes in the environment, point with inexorable logic to the presence of a plan in the operations of nature? Does there exist anywhere in the

² Edwin G. Conklin, "Biology and Religion" in *Princeton Alumni Weekly* (March, 1925).

world—or is it even possible for the human mind to conceive—a more certain criterion of intelligence than the deft adaptation of means to attain a definite end? The data of science offer unmistakable evidence of the existence of plan, design and purpose in nature. But does not design necessarily imply a designer? Does not purpose imply an intelligence perceiving the end or purpose to be attained? This demand of our rational nature for a cause adequate to explain the observed facts is not satisfied by a reference to matter and its forces. For matter is blind and unintelligent.

Whence comes the intelligence, for instance, which guides the elements of hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon and oxygen in the performance of the action of photosynthesis, whereby these lifeless inorganic elements are changed into living functioning protoplasm which reproduces itself and carries on all the other processes of the life cycle? This is a chemical action of such tremendous complexity as to baffle the ingenuity of the greatest chemists to reproduce or even to understand. The chemist can tear down for you the structure of a blade of grass and tell you all the elements which are there and the proportions in which they exist, but he cannot put them together in such a way that they will function as a blade of grass. In the tiniest protoplasmic cell there is a molecular arrangement, a coördination of functions, a vital principle, an entelechy (call it what you will), which guides the millions of atoms in the deft performance of the processes of life—assimilation of food, growth and reproduction. How these protons and electrons in the atom of a protoplasmic cell are able to bridge that yawning chasm between the inorganic and the organic universe, transforming inert lifeless matter into vital substance, is a mystery which transcends the genius of the greatest scientists in the world to understand. But the regular consistent facile solving of a problem that baffles human ingenuity to solve manifests unquestionably skillful adaptation of means to an end, manifests the work of a lawgiver, manifests the presence of a Mind behind the framework of the universe.

DISCOVERY OF METHOD DOES NOT LESSEN DESIGN

Nor would the force of this reasoning be in any way weakened by the possibility that science may at some future date discover the technique by which nature transforms inorganic matter into vital

substance, and may then duplicate the process in her laboratory. In what way does the discovery of the method of arranging means to attain a difficult end lessen the evidence of intelligence on the part of the designer? When the student of engineering after years of application finally masters the method of erecting a sixty-story steel skyscraper on a site that offered little more than treacherous quicksand as a foundation and is able to duplicate the performance himself, does his achievement detract from the science of structural engineering or reduce it to mere child's play? On the contrary, every fresh achievement in this field adds new glory to the science, confirming the cogency of its reasoning and the accuracy of its methods.

If this line of reasoning is valid for every achievement of human endeavor, as it is universally admitted to be, why should it lose an atom of its cogency when applied to the achievements of nature? Yet, when science discovers a few fragments of the technique used by nature in her operations, there has been a strange tendency on the part of some to depreciate the evidence of intelligent design and to have recourse to chance, accident or to the fact that, like Topsy, it "just happened" that way. In commenting on this human eccentricity, Le Conte says:

"It is curious to observe how, when the question is concerning a work of Nature, we no sooner find out how a thing is made than we immediately exclaim: 'It is not made at all, it became so of itself!' So long as we knew not how worlds were made, we of course concluded that they must have been created, but so soon as science showed *how* it was probably done, immediately we say we were mistaken—they were not made at all. So also, so long as we could not imagine how new organic forms originated, we were willing to believe they were created, but, so soon as we find that they originated by evolution, many at once say: 'We were mistaken; no creator is necessary at all.'

"Is this so when the question is concerning a work of man? Yes, of one kind—viz., the work of the magician. Here, indeed, we believe in him, and are delighted with his work, until we know how it is done, and then all our faith and wonder cease. But in any honest work it is not so; but, on the contrary, when we understand how it is done, stupid wonder is changed into intellectual delight. Does it not seem, then, that to most people God is a mere wonder-worker, a chief magician? But the mission of science is to show us how things are done. Is it any wonder, then, that to such persons science is constantly destroying their superstitious

illusions? But if God is an honest worker, according to reason—i. e., according to law—ought not science rather to change gaping wonder into intelligent delight—superstition into rational worship?"³

THE UNIVERSAL REIGN OF LAW

The evidence of design and plan exists, not only in the world of living nature, but in the administration of the inorganic universe as well. Whether one looks at the orderly arrangement existing among the celestial bodies tracing their orbits through illimitable space, or whether one penetrates into the world of microcosms and follows the activities of the ultimate constituents of a molecule of matter, one is confronted with the unmistakable evidence of co-ordination of a high order. A short time ago men thought of atoms as small pellets of inert matter which were joined in some way to form molecules. But today science has penetrated into the structure of the atom, finding in it a nucleus of positive discharge called the *proton*, around which circulate one or more *electrons* of negative discharge. What appears as solid inert matter is now found, when examined with the most delicate instruments of science, to be in a state of ceaseless motion. Is there coördination even in this new world of inorganic microcosms which science has recently disclosed?

One of the foremost authorities in this field of subatomic matter is Professor Michael Pupin of Columbia University who thus answers the question: "Science teaches us that the visible universe is a macrocosm, consisting of invisible granular microcosms, and that the cosmic granules, the atoms and molecules, the electrons and protons, the organic cells and their microscopic components of life are all endowed with the power of practically autonomous action. A countless swarm of autonomous granules is obviously chaotic. Heat is chaotic, because it is the action of the chaotic motion of the molecules of the hot body; light is chaotic, because it is the action of the chaotic motion of the electron in the atoms of the luminous body; chemical reactions are chaotic, because they are the actions of the chaotic atoms and molecules. . . . And yet, in the midst of this invisible all-embracing chaos, there rise here, there,

³ Le Conte, "Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought," pp. 287-8.

and everywhere the visible beauties of orderly creation just like so many blessed islands of beautiful order rising from the turbulence of a storm-tossed sea. There is, therefore, in every nook and corner of the universe a never-ceasing transformation of the primordial chaos into a cosmos of simple law and beautiful order.”⁴

It is evident, therefore, that nature bears unmistakably the imprint of purpose and plan. It is stamped indelibly upon the organization and functioning of the world of subatomic matter not less than upon the galaxy of worlds traversing the illimitable expanse of inter-stellar space. Especially is it manifest in the world of living organisms from the rudimentary unicellular amoeba to the complex highly developed vertebrate. Instead of dwarfing the evidence of purpose in nature or in the universe, evolution affords a far grander and more sublime expression of the creative power of God operating, not fitfully or whimsically, but in accordance with laws definitely established by Him. Far from removing God from the universe, evolution renders His presence on the throne of nature, guiding life in its myriad forms from lowly beginnings to higher and more complex forms, more imperative and indispensable than ever before. Instead of the crude anthropomorphic concept of a Deity working as a master mechanic constantly interfering with natural processes to make needed adjustments, evolution affords us a far grander concept of a God who operates through the laws of nature which have been established by Him. In place of the old picture of a world created in a moment of time, evolution discloses a more sublime panorama of the creative power of God unfolding itself in the gradual development of the world and of all living creatures.

⁴ Michael Pupin, “Creative Co-ordination” (American Institute of Sacred Literature, Chicago), 1928, pp. 3-4.

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

VII. Non Habet ubi Ponat Caput

By C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., M.A.

The subject we touched on last month was of such overwhelming importance that I may be forgiven if I continue to speak of it from another angle. Our Lord did not and could not speak of money or even riches as bad in itself, and was in fact buried in a rich man's grave, as was prophesied. Our Lord never actually said that to earn or even to inherit large fortunes was sinful. But nobody in his senses can read the Gospels and suppose He *liked* money. "Make to yourselves friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness, so that, when you fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations," appears to me, despite most commentators, to be spoken with bitter irony. "Mammon of unrighteousness" means unrighteous mammon (*i.e.*, money wrongfully obtained): so certainly you cannot make friends with God by means of *that* save simply by making restitution and getting rid of it. And precisely the very last thing which that fleeting illusory thing which wealth is can do for you, is to receive you into anything enduring—let alone everlasting. It remains that Our Lord speaks with the utmost suspicion, dislike, even virulent condemnation of riches.

Now, I see three dangers to which we easily succumb—two of them proper to the sheer pursuance of our duty. The first, however, concerns being comfortable. We can quickly get over this. Our Lord promised to give us comfort, but not to make us comfortable. Indeed, if we have the full apostolic spirit and are all day long hungering and thirsting for the maximum as regards our parish or mission, no amount of leather armchairs, or cushions, or ornamental pipe-racks, or photos of pals, or gadgets enabling us to turn the light off from our bed, or hot and cold water laid in our rooms, or much more which to me in my country implies real luxury, not mere comfortableness—well, not the whole of this will make me feel comfortable. I shall receive from the Lord the little worm to gnaw into my sheltering gourd. Even with Wesley, I shall call out: "Lord, if Thou seest me nesting, give me a thorn." A very good prayer is: "Lord, never allow me, please, to *be comfort-*

able." If you are comfortable as a habit, or seek to be so, believe me every edge will get blunted, every ideal smudged, every motive devitalized.

But the first danger of a more elusive sort that we shall run will be that of judging success in terms of money. Impossible as it may seem, even a priest of Christ may pay more attention to a man because he has a lot of money than to one who has but little. I know that there are delicacies of behavior here! While we never ought to accept from a man large sums of money for the building (say) of a school or cathedral, if we *know* that that money has been illicitly made (still less, accept donations as a sort of "hush money"), yet we dare not turn a fear or suspicion into an open declaration of hostility. We must carefully not be Manichees, and I would add to the section on "Comfort," that it may not be a bad thing if once in a while we give ourselves a bit of comfort so as to be unable to say to ourselves that we have "never" allowed ourselves so and so. Anyone who is in danger of pluming himself on never having touched alcohol, or been to a cinema or to a race meeting, may just as well break that record once or twice so as not to be able to boast. And then we ought not to *look* too uncomfortable, else we make other people feel uncomfortable, and people can be frightened off by our seeming altogether too aloof from ordinary things. I knew a priest, now dead, who was personally extremely "mortified," and from whom every one collected an impression of absolute unselfishness: yet, one of the most delightful things was to see him sink into a basket-chair and light a cigar, a full-blown vision of comfortableness. At once people felt: "He'll understand me." And *never* did they make the clumsy error of thinking him a sensual or comfort-ridden man. Somewhat in the same way I have no objection to people accepting from rich folk what rich folk *ought* to give.

All the same, I can allow myself so to be obsessed with the notion of money that my sermons may be about little else. I have already mentioned the case of a girl whom I am instructing by correspondence, and whom I asked to attend High Mass so as to profit by the sermon too. She wrote to say that it was no good her going there, for the sermon was always about the money wanted for so and so. I asked her to go to another parish, where a very simple

priest, whom I first knew when he was a good little soldier, needs relatively as much money as the other one, but hardly mentions it, and, upon my word, I believe gets relatively more. I know them both. One is a financial genius, and he gets when he asks. But not to him would I go to ask an explanation of the doctrine of Christ; to the other, who annoys me sometimes with his childlikeness, I would. I can remember an occasion when an entire pilgrimage was shocked to the marrow by a prelate who, in a very sacred place, nudged a pilgrim and said (all but with a wink): "We like stipends." And I can think of two other pilgrimages where the faithful have been definitely scandalized by the obvious profiteering in the shrine. I once went—one bitterly cold, rainy, windy Spring day—to 11 o'clock Mass in the pro-cathedral of a very Catholic city. I was to sit in the choir—it was some function or other. I had to fight my way through dense crowds outside in the streets, drenched and frozen, hearing their Mass of obligation, or at least eager to be in "moral union" with that Mass because they could hear the Sanctus bell; and again fighting my way through the crowds that were standing in the aisles. And when at last I could look down into the church, behold the whole middle of it was empty! I asked what could possibly be the meaning of this, and was told that *those* seats belonged to persons who hired seats at so much per annum, and so "of course" no one else could be let into them! I spent that Mass praying that that Invincible Ignorance might be dispelled by which alone could be explained that mortal sin was not *somewhere* being committed. I register my conviction that Christ, had He come there otherwise than as a shame-faced inhabitant of the Tabernacle, would have taken a scourge of very heavy cords indeed, or at least gone out into the cold, and "compelled them to come in." Possibly He Himself would have been scourged, or anyway hustled out of sight.

Very briefly I will add that we can use the "beauty of the Lord's House" all too easily as an excuse for neglecting the proper disposal of money. A priest can quite well, without realizing it, want to leave some tangible expression of his rectorate like a tower, a carillon, a redecoration of a shrine, and meanwhile much concerned with housing, endowment of beds, creation of Catholic hostels, and what not in his district may be going neglected. It is

not the least good quoting (as is so often done) the remark: "To what purpose is this waste? Might not this have been sold and given to the poor?" because the remark was made by Judas, who was certainly annoyed at the pouring out of the ointment, because, had it been sold for the poor, the price would have gone into the common purse and he would have stolen it.

But one wants to see the result of one's gift. One definitely does want to eat one's cake and keep it. We want to see our alms surviving in the new candlestick or statue. It is far more difficult to get people to contribute to an invisible thing even when it tends to their own comfort, like a heating apparatus, than to a visible thing, like a statue of the Little Flower.

I finish these two articles by repeating that money is not bad in itself, but is always dangerous, usually corruptive, and never a cause for judging anyone the better for its possession.

WHY GALLOPERS?

By GEORGE ZIMPFER

Of late, the crusade against the well-known "galloper," that clerical genius who speeds *ab amictu ad amictum* "in eighteen minutes flat," has waxed a bit warm. Sly digs and tempered ridicule have evidently been judged ineffective, and zeal now explodes into righteous wrath. But whether the well-meant efforts of anyone human can correct the culprit is extremely doubtful. There is no doubt, however, that protests, violent or suave, have a wholesome effect, if not upon the galloper himself, at least upon those of us who are susceptible to his disease.

But is it sufficient merely to point out such a man's defects? If galloping must be classed as a sacerdotal disease, surely it merits the lancet and serious probing. It is principally this, it seems, that we have missed hitherto in our references to the subject.

The seminary, of course, has taken its poundings in this and other discussions of sacerdotal weaknesses, and emerged from the fracas surprisingly unscathed. And as scapegoats in such discussions our seminary professors have shown an admirable control of the tongue. Perhaps they have meditated upon the futility of defense, or depend upon their former students to make their defense for them. At any rate, though there is doubtless much room for improvement in seminary methods, it is obvious injustice to refer all our defects to our clerical cradle—especially galloping, since the average *ordinandus* dares not gallop for fear his steed may throw him. It is so easy to condemn unfavorable consequences; it is very difficult to anticipate them. Can any priest sincerely believe that seminary authorities ignore evident defects, or that they are in a position to know the sometimes serious but hidden blemishes in a candidate for Orders? If so, he is harboring a rather serious accusation—and a false one. For anyone who has lived the seminary life should know that seminarians, oftener than seminary officials, have the more intimate knowledge of the defects of their fellows. And of course, due to a false sense of honor, their mouths are sealed. Seminary authorities may suspect defects, but it is a rash man who acts upon suspicion alone. If seminary authorities should so act, they would be un-

worthy of their office. As a matter of fact, even dyed-in-the-wool professors love their priesthood and desire spiritual sons. Unless they have lost all spiritual initiative in the performance of daily, vexatious tasks, unless they have fallen into a spiritual rut, they are far more apt to see in the imperfect seminarian a potential *alter Christus* than a hopeless ass. Though a lad may show conclusively that his educational groundwork has been faulty, few priests, seminary officials or otherwise, would dare to present the *consilium abeundi* for that reason alone. It is an extremely delicate matter to assist the Almighty in the choice of His anointed representatives.

We cannot, it is true, deny that there are too many candidates for Orders who are poorly equipped mentally. And as a zealous Monsignor has pointedly remarked: "You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." There are some things which the seminary has a right to presume. Among these are a working knowledge of Latin, the mastery of correct methods of study, and a developed sense of personal responsibility. When these are lacking, the seminary builds upon a precarious foundation. If we truly desire to fix the blame for the galloper and other clerical misfits, let us rather look to the preparatory course which in the past too many of our seminarians have received. With due respect, let us scrutinize the standards of our diocesan examinations for adoption. The first of these, at least, will demonstrate the need of preparatory seminaries adapted to American conditions, not high schools which deal with a general class of students.

The galloper, especially, can very often trace the origin of his disease to this faulty preparation—very often, specifically, to a shaky and vague course in Latin. As for Greek, let it rest in peace. By some magic he gets by the diocesan examination and presents himself to some unfortunate seminary, which henceforth bears the burden patiently and attempts the thankless task of making a student out of a lad who has never learned even the proper methods of study.

The result is what we have on the word of competent seminarians—that too many of their fellows require constant help to translate even their daily assignments in moral and dogmatic theology. Can we expect defectives of this kind to derive any fruit from the daily reading of the not-too-easy Latin of the Mass or Breviary? Here,

undoubtedly, is a breeding-pool of the galloper whose interest in the beautiful prayers of the Mass (to say nothing of the poetry of the Breviary) is confined solely to the problem of slipping words from his tongue faster than anyone else. If even those who attain to some appreciation of the many-faceted Orations, Secrets and Post-communions, who are able to follow the sometimes intricate word-order of the Latin, feel the necessity to control the tendency to speed and the need of constant attention, how can we expect one who never knew and perhaps never will know what he is reading to take time for even a fragmentary appreciation of the sacred text?

II

But obviously the galloper is not always a poor Latinist. By far the greater number of our priestly youngsters come from the seminary with the vision of a perfect priestly life. Unfortunately, it is not long before the vision is dimmed. Looking back, who of us will say that he viewed the sublime privilege of the Mass indifferently? What a terrific earnestness was ours as we tackled the intricacies of the ceremonies! How careful we were about the outstretched hands, the tracing of the cross, and the precise measurement of the profound bow! If we saw a scandalously speedy celebration of Mass in the seminary, we were the more determined never to insult our priesthood in like manner. So with many a clerical galloper. But, alas, moral courage was lacking. None of us really welcomes criticism, no matter how we may protest that we do. And none of us is proof against the shafts of ridicule, especially if these are dipped in sacerdotal bile. But, thanks to the seminary, most of us have moral courage. The galloper quits. Under pressure, his notion of ideals changes. He thinks of them no longer as heights to be ever striven for but as heights inaccessible, and therefore inconsistent with the adult view of life.

Two considerations especially urge him to compromise and surrender. There is, first, a growing inclination to view his sublime powers with the easy nonchalance of his elders. There is also the desire to impress the laity. It is a well-known fact that the average newly ordained priest is acutely conscious of his inexperience. He comes to his first appointment desiring to please all and conscious of his great privilege. In his seminary dreams how often had he

seen himself, walking among men, proud and thankful for his right to wear the Roman collar! He had seen himself arrayed in the sacred livery of Christ's anointed, offering the Great Sacrifice. In the night, lying upon his hard seminary bed, he had prayed fiercely for strength in the face of sickness and death, and had offered himself, half in fear, as the victim of contagious disease. He had sworn that never, day or night, would he refuse a soul that stood in need of his absolution. But gradually, after ordination, had come the sad disillusionment. A "wise crack" from the first assistant about his "marvellous speed" at Mass or in the confessional brings the flush of embarrassment to his cheeks and a roar of laughter from "the boss." Curate Number 2, endeavoring to spread the impression of his own sophistication, seconds the remark with a sly allusion to a "growing reputation as a spiritual guide." The first reproof from the pastor for "dawdling" over his Mass he stands with reasonable fortitude—but with a sore and wondering heart, for in the seminary he had never thought of the possibility of being reproofed for an excess of piety. But strong indeed must be the moral fiber that can stand such attacks for months with steady resolution, not only from one's associates but from clerical visitors as well. The result is too often the making of a galloper. Sickness of heart and disappointment lead gradually to doubt as to the correctness of his attitude. A feeling of loneliness gets in its deadly work, and a perfectly natural desire for human approbation aids the surrender. He dreads the "wise cracks," and often quite unconsciously this dread mounts until it submerges the conviction that he is right. He is licked.

Speed now develops, and comments decrease. Speed increases, and pride swells. In his anxiety to stand "ace high" with his associates, he begins gradually to mimic their "wise cracks" at the expense of a younger victim. He begins to do his share of bragging, and speed in all priestly work is his notion of priestly perfection. He likes to consider himself hard, practical and sophisticated. The newly-minted coin has become tarnished. . . . "And *His own* received Him not."

And aiding this sad transformation is a swiftly growing condescension to all that pertained to his seminary days. He is positive that no man is so green as he who steps from a seminary. Daily meditation is done hurriedly and irregularly and soon ceases; it is,

forsooth, but another manifestation of greenness. The Scriptures repose unmolested in the bookcase. Ascetical articles in his clerical magazines are passed over with a grunt of disgust. Visits to the Blessed Sacrament, Stations and the Rosary are impossible because the time is completely occupied with practical duties. The spiritual flame flickers and burns low. Values have been inverted. The galloper of this stripe has no such defense as his brother with the defective knowledge of Latin. His faults are more irritating because, instead of realizing that he has been a moral weakling, he is convinced that he has the caliber of a leader. And to the laity he gives the greater scandal. If aware of it, our people will always condone some measure of ignorance, but their gorge rises at the sacerdotal show-off. They feel that their faith is being attacked when they see such a man performing his sacred duties as if one thing alone mattered—to get a boring job over and done with!

III

Another prominent species of galloper traces the origin of the disease to an evil almost universal in this day of dissipated energy—a weakness of will that betrays itself in an incapacity for persistent effort and an inability to take pains with anything. Perhaps a too blunt description would be “mental laziness.” Anyone accustomed to classroom work is familiar with this prevalent root-disease, and a bit of introspection will perhaps reveal traces of the malady in ourselves. And it is the triumph of irony that the modern system of primary education, with its variety of unrelated subjects and its failure to emphasize the value of the will, has aided the evil. Too many potential priests are weak-willed long before the idea of a vocation has entered their heads.

To some it may smack too much of psychoanalysis to see in the rushing, chasuble-swinging, swiftly mumbling, slovenly galloper the victim of a stunted will or a lad incapable of persistent effort. But “as the twig is bent, the tree inclines.” It is a disagreeable fact indeed that so generally the mental training of our children is shaped by methods which to a great extent ignore the will. From the earliest years the child is given an assortment of facts to master by memory, together with a very limited course in the use of the intellectual faculty. The cramming of this mass of more or less useful

matter into the youngster's head is seldom accomplished by a judicious and *systematic* appeal to motives calculated to produce a love of knowledge, but often by a polite (and sometimes not polite) system of moral suasion which produces distaste, resentment, boredom, bitterness and a developed sense of revolt. Too many teachers appeal to no motives or to motives unsuited to move the will to tasks which require care, accuracy and continued application. These intangible but invaluable characteristics, among others, are really to education what the soul is to the body. They cannot be established in the soul by sarcasm, ridicule or fear, nor can they develop without cultivation. Weekly or monthly tests, the assignment and reading of marks, while motivating, are still productive of merely spasmodic efforts. And in this mental state, with the memory loaded with masses of irrelevant facts, with the intellect functioning principally in the field of mathematics, and the will with its tremendous possibilities almost wholly neglected, the child is advanced to high school.

Then comes the struggle. Many a high school teacher complains bitterly that the transition has been too abrupt, without seeing that the transition would have little wrong with it if more attention had been paid to will training. When we wonder why so many students fail to complete the high school course or slip by with difficulty, let us put our finger on the sore spot—weak wills. A concession, it is true, may be made sometimes to our parochial schools, since there the system of will-building which is part and parcel of the Church's policy may be used effectively. Is it always thus used? If Daily Mass is systematically urged with appropriate motives, if religion is recognized as the *raison d'être* of the school, if the students are taught thoroughly that the Cross of Christ means not only resignation but the cheerful acceptance of difficult duty, if reception of the Sacraments entails even slight sacrifice, the ordinary child can scarcely go through eight years of this without some education of the will. The pity is that this very evil which those in authority are supposed to combat has often left its traces on, or numbers among its victims, the teachers and guides of the young. And if wrong pedagogical methods are used in high school, if a future candidate for Orders is so unfortunate as to have instructors who, like so many in the teaching profession, are tempted daily—if they are not thoroughly victimized—by a sense of futility and discourage-

ment, and so care little about the inner workings of the child, it only means that the habit of mental sloth grows more fixed and permanent. If the contrary is the case, if the teacher employs judicious means to arouse the will to steady effort, the exultation of such spiritual conquest is keen and compensating, for teacher and pupil are victors. Which type of instructor is the more common?

Little wonder, then, that of the thousands issuing from high school here and there a lad muddles through a year or two of college and a diocesan examination for adoption and forthwith dons the Roman collar and a cassock. In the seminary, such a lad is usually "on the fence"—neither capable enough to allay all doubt as to his fitness nor so hopeless as to warrant dismissal.

The seminary course, in itself, is eminently qualified to develop will power, and oftener than is suspected it stiffens a wavering will. In these cases, that shadowy brother of the will, *good will*, is a prerequisite. If that is lacking, the seminary fights a losing battle, and the "gold brick" goes along undetected. Study continues to be a penance for him, and he hounds the conscientious worker for assistance, sometimes even stooping to dishonesty in examinations. He is very careful to space properly his aberrations from the rule and thus create the impression that human frailty and not a chronic incapacity to conform is responsible. Convenient absences from class on the plea of illness are not openly questioned, if they are not too frequent. And nothing, of course, happens if the professor neglects to inform the director through some little will weakness of his own. A certain genius in devising means to avoid troublesome tasks is known to no one generally except the seminarians who accept perforce the burdens he avoids. And it must not be forgotten that seminarians hold the common American views regarding the squealer and the cry-baby. Even though they realize the damage they do by shielding the shirker, and in spite of their complaints about his "getting away with murder," the "code of honor" prevails. Who will say that all this is imagination, and that "gold bricks" in cassocks have not been ordained?

And what can change the gold-brick attitude after ordination? If the check-rein of the seminary held such men merely to a very imperfect observance of rule, how can we suppose a change after the check-rein has been released? Such characters, much more

rapidly than others, become careless and slovenly in the performance of their sacred duties, all of which require some concentration. The Mass, being the principal public function of their lives, most clearly betrays their weakness. As we all know, the Holy Sacrifice, to be offered properly, demands constant vigilance and care. The faculty of attention must be at its best, for the tendency to lapse into mechanical action is very insidious and easily leads to abuses that in many a priest are altogether unconscious.

But what of the more difficult accomplishment—the fixed attention upon the meaning of the sacred words as they slip so readily from our lips? How many priests are perfectly familiar with all the grammatical peculiarities of the Canon which they recite each day? How many follow faithfully that tremendous sentence that includes the *Communicantes*? And what about the movable parts of the Mass—the ever-changing, beautifully fashioned, expressive and concise Orations, Secrets and Postcommunions? Do we flatter ourselves that we can read them at sight with proper understanding, with all their peculiar idioms, their allusions and inferences, without a deliberate and almost constant tightening of the will? Does the weak-willed priest, the gold brick of seminary days, do justice to his exalted privilege? Is he willing to make the effort? Can he? There is only one answer to that.

Before long he is a confirmed galloper. Like his brothers mentioned above, he will defend his weakness by profuse argumentation. On this point at least he knows his theology. He will inform you glibly about the various opinions of theologians in regard to the minimum time for Holy Mass; what is required for the integrity of confession. He will claim consideration for his people, and call you a selfish dawdler. And you cannot accuse him of deliberate sin; all that is certain is that his actions disedify. And try to convince him of that! Even theology seems to favor him, for a fault committed in good faith is surely no sin. The supreme pity is often that such persons are actually in good faith, actually see no harm nor wrong in their habits, with the result that critics, too sure of their own impeccability, rave in vain and at last subside with an uncomfortable feeling of utter futility.

SCHOOL RECORDS AND REPORTS

By PAUL E. CAMPBELL, A.M., Litt.D., LL.D.

We live in an age devoted to the scientific study of education. Tools and techniques of experimentation and research evolve daily. Some students of education invent their own tools and techniques; others adapt tools and techniques already applied to other fields. Today we measure educational achievement with desperate accuracy, and venture into the field of prophecy after measuring mental ability and intelligence. Meticulously we apply statistical methods to the study of educational data.

Perhaps as a result of these developments has come increased attention to records and reports. The vogue of standard tests and statistical methods has awakened school administrators to the need of improvement in record-keeping and reporting. If records and reports are to serve any purpose save the gratifying of a vanity such as King David had in the counting of his people, they must measure up to certain standards objectively determined, and they must maintain a certain degree of uniformity. Tradition has long been supreme in this field. Superintendent Jones kept certain records and made certain reports because his predecessor Smith recorded and reported thus. Records and reports carefully filed in neat steel files commanded respect. They were regarded with a certain mysterious awe. Responsible school officials *felt* they had value, though they were by no means sure just what that value was.

Scientific study can reveal the data essential for the management of a school system. This study will evolve desirable record forms for the recording of these data. Studies so far conducted prove that much of the work done in the past was haphazard and wellnigh useless. The Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association discovered much in a brief survey made a few years ago. There is pressing need for greater uniformity and standardization. No great ability as an investigator is necessary to determine that conditions are somewhat chaotic when one city system in its reports demands one set of facts, while another asks for an entirely different set of facts. Some cities use only a few forms, others use hundreds. States are worse: they run riot from less

than a dozen forms to more than 500. Twenty-two monthly report blanks asked for certain facts varying in number from 7 to 26. There was a grand total of 88 different facts, but 53 per cent of these appeared on but one form. There was an utter lack of uniformity or standardization inasmuch as the twenty-two forms agreed on no single "recordable" fact. Yet, these supplied information to various superintendents to fill out the same State form. Sometimes a minor school official is required to report to various superior officers, State and Federal, who are in equally hopeless disagreement regarding facts to be ascertained and recorded.

Child-accounting must be rescued from this subjective maelstrom. We must establish an objective basis. The Survey Committee of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association determined that child-accounting should facilitate administrative control, mechanize routines, and make possible the measurement of the efficiency of the schools, the prediction of future needs, comparison with other school systems, and the development of economies in plant, in goods utilized, and in services employed. In short, child-accounting provides the factual foundation upon which school practice should be based. The same Survey Committee prepared an extensive bibliography on the subject, which is given in full in Volume XXVI of *The Teachers' College Record*, pages 767 to 782. One hundred and sixty-one sources on the various phases of child-accounting are enumerated. The Committee made no claims to a complete bibliography; they noted the possibility of errors and omissions. Obviously that bibliography cannot be reproduced here.

The Committee on Uniform Records and Reports that followed up the work of this Survey Committee did not wish to appear unduly dogmatic. The determination of an objective basis in child-accounting is extremely difficult. The report of these Committees emphasizes their view that final pronouncements must be made with caution as to just what data should be reported by a school system and as to just what reports should be made. They venture to present forms representative of good practice, but urge at the same time that each school system evaluate several alternative sets of forms in the light of the best theory and its own peculiar needs. The individual school official in a subordinate position may have a very well developed objective basis for his school records; he may know that

these twelve facts—and these twelve only—are vital to the conduct of his school, but where a superior officer demands the number of blue-eyed children in the sixth grade, he must supply the information.

Scientific study suggests that no item of information be collected which is not used, that no record or item be duplicated unless valid reason exists for such duplication, and that the various records and reports be coördinated and unified. Under the heading of permanent and cumulative pupil records—forms, namely, on which are made original entries of important data and subsequent additions and alterations, uniformly, for every child in the school system throughout his entire school history—the Committee on Uniform Records and Reports recommends: (1) a teacher's daily register book; (2) a pupil's general cumulative record; (3) a pupil's health record; (4) a pupil's vocational guidance record; (5) a pupil's psychological clinic record; (6) the principal's office record card. If there are no departments in health education, guidance and psychological testing with which the child comes in contact, there is, of course, no need for records 3, 4 and 5. These pupil records are designed to render efficient the routine administration of a school system and the work of instruction, guidance and health "follow-up." Well-devised records avoid much clerical work and useless duplication of items, and enable the teacher to become more readily and more thoroughly acquainted with his pupils. Incidentally, adequate records facilitate enforcement of compulsory attendance laws and supply the data for important studies and investigation, among which are age-grade studies, the progress of pupils, the causes of failure, the holding power of different school units, and various relationship studies. Scholarship, mentality, physical ability, and even nationality, have some bearing on attendance. Who expects a nation of poets to score perfect attendance in the glorious spring-time?

These pupil records should be cumulative, adding new information, changing old data, but retaining the original record throughout the child's school history. It is patent that the record should be of durable material, and, while avoiding useless duplication and maintaining uniformity, it should never fail to give the teacher information essential for adapting instruction to the needs of the pupil.

The person having greatest need for the data reported should file the records. Too often cards that would supply a doctor, a nurse or a teacher with vital information, do nothing but gather dust in a superintendent's office.

We cannot enter into a complete description of the various records. The teacher's daily register book must be primarily an attendance record, but it may provide space also for the recording of monthly scholarship marks in all subjects. Nor should we clutter up the register with data that properly belongs on the pupil's cumulative record. This record—formerly called the admission, discharge and promotion card—has been much developed since 1912. It is kept by the regular classroom teacher or the teacher in closest contact with the pupil. It should be most accessible to the individual most needing it. On it is recorded a complete story of the child's past school and home history. The form devised by Moehlman of the University of Michigan provides a cumulative record of the entire school life of the pupil. It is a record, not only of scholarship, but a physical record, a standard test record, and a record showing the interests and vocational aptitudes of the child. We believe the Moehlman card—the Michigan cumulative record—superior to the packet system of Stenquist (Baltimore).

Health, guidance and psychological clinic records are usually in the hands of the heads of these respective departments. These heads determine the form of card used. The Report from which we quote ventures to say only this: "The almost entire lack of uniformity in practices pertaining to guidance renders it unwise for the Committee to suggest any single guidance record." The principal's office record is in its required information a duplicate of the pupil's cumulative record. This record remains in the principal's office. The pupil will have as many of these cards in different offices as he attends schools in the course of his academic career.

Moehlman is not content with the child-accounting forms that grew out of the National Education Association 1911-1912 Report. These records carry only the academic records of the child. He advocates child-accounting that includes health, social, emotional, vocational, achievement and mental test records in addition to academic data. His record requirements are accuracy, continuity and adequacy. Carefully devised and uniform methods secure accuracy.

A definite policy and the mechanical provision of proper forms insure continuity. Adequacy is provided for by a single form or report, following the child throughout his school life, gathering continuously and permanently recording the pupil's (a) personal history, (b) social background, (c) academic achievement on the basis of standardized and intelligence tests, (d) primary emotional characteristics, (e) vocational tendencies and opportunities, and (f) health data.

The pupil's report card is usually retained as the traditional mode of contact with the parent. The report card is almost universally used. Parents expect it and look forward to seeing it. The complete report indicates to parents how they may coöperate with the school to help their children. Remedies to overcome deficiencies or weaknesses are suggested, and parents are led to appreciate and understand the broader and more modern aims of the school. The modern parent must not rest content with an academic horizon that embraces only the "Three R" idea of education. Briefly, the report card aims to give a complete inventory of the child's attainments, not merely his scholastic achievements. The prevailing frequency of the pupil report is monthly, but 39 per cent of those analyzed in a recent study (Goldstein) covered longer periods from six to twelve weeks. The rating is usually in specific subjects, and this seems desirable. Literal marks find favor with progressive school administrators. The letters used have certain per cent equivalents in a majority of cases, but frequently the given letters are merely symbols for certain descriptive terms, such as, Excellent, Good, Fair, Passing, Average, etc. A scale of numbers on a basis of five or ten has some proponents. The normal probability curve is the norm in many places. The standard report card of the future will likely include (in addition to ratings in scholarship) ratings in citizenship, ratings in health, suggestions for improvement, space for comments by teacher and by parents, and provision for self-rating by pupil where feasible and for rating improvement and giving encouragement to the pupil. The traditional 3 inches by 5 inches or 4 inches by 6 inches card will no longer serve. The four-page booklet on stiff paper, says Goldstein, will come into more common use. The card now generally used has insufficient space for the various items needed.

Of the superintendent Moehlman says only that he needs more

general records, records which lend themselves to the appraisal of conditions within the schools and indicate their degree of success. His appraisal records, prepared from the permanent forms necessary for child and teacher, should include: (1) promotions and failures, (2) age-grade data, (3) age-grade-progress reports, and (4) individual achievement records upon the basis of standard tests. The superintendent must have also such complementary records of teacher training and teacher efficiency as will enable him to develop and present a general statement of conditions. Uniform practice among superintendents of parish schools demands also a principal's report on registration, a supervisor's report on school conditions, and a permanent individual record of teachers. A majority of parish superintendents request also a record of admissions and discharges throughout the year together with some report on the physical condition of the school building. In some dioceses the latter report is submitted to a committee of school visitors chosen from the membership of the diocesan school board. A smaller number of parish superintendents ask for a school census, permanent individual records of pupils, and monthly reports of school attendance.

We approach the problem of the proper contents of the report of the superintendent of parish schools with some trepidation. Shall we look over a number of reports and summarize the points of information contained as the standard report? Is the best report one that fairly bristles with figures neatly arranged in statistical tables? Shall we stand in awe of the rhetorical analysis that sounds the praises of Catholic education and predicts for it a brilliant future?

Some question the advisability of any report. This skepticism seems unreasonable. The report is at least a record of accomplishment. Reports are characteristic of good business procedure. The reading of such a record is designed to stimulate and direct further activity. Without activity, well directed activity, we cannot progress. We may say that the report of the superintendent of parish schools promotes the progress of the school system.

We here assume the advisability of a report. Perhaps reports in the past have fallen into disrepute because they were nothing more than a combination of a school directory and endless tables of statistics. The force of custom effected the annual publication of extensive tables long after the original purpose of publication had

ceased to exist. Reports presented long tables of statistics that were never seriously examined even by members of the diocesan school boards. When analysis and interpretation were lacking, the average lay reader was unable to extract from them the information that they are supposed to convey. The diocesan school report may be too vague and general to present local conditions of a given town or parish in a vital, interesting manner. The presentation of statistics may be so technical in character that only the special student can follow and interpret them. The highly technical report does not seem proper to the parish school system where one of the great purposes, even as in the public school field, is publicity—publicity for the further purpose of gaining and holding the good will of the public that pays the bill. The parish schools are supported by the people who love them, and one of the primary purposes of a report of schools should be to show by their fruits that they are worthy of this love.

The parish school report shall not, therefore, content itself with a presentation of highly technical statistical tables. It will better serve its general purpose by presenting in readily intelligible fashion the facts that appeal as well to the layman as to the specialist in school administration. Tradition, well supported by experience, insists that an analytic interpretation of all statistical tables is very acceptable to the run-of-mine reader. The statistics should be sufficiently detailed and summarized in such a way as to elicit the interest of each and every school district of the diocese.

The superintendent who has set up standards of achievement will desire to portray the degree of success his program is having. The mere recording of the children of school age, the children attending, the school membership and the total enrollment, the number of teachers and the number of schools, will not do this.

A study of age-grade data, the record of promotions and failures, and a record of individual achievement will present a more accurate picture of genuine progress. An annual account of teacher preparation and teacher certification may be necessary to stimulate constructive activity while we are in the in-service training era. The results of special studies made by educational authorities within the diocese rightly find a place in the annual report when no provision is made for separate publication. A careful record of the affiliation of sec-

ondary schools and, where necessary, of elementary schools will encourage those in charge to care for this wellnigh indispensable requirement. Catholic parents are becoming increasingly aware of the handicap under which graduates of non-accredited schools labor. Those in charge of our schools have a sacred duty to provide that attendance at Catholic high schools shall not impede the future academic progress of our students. A summary of local, state or federal laws that affect the parish schools is always in place. The report can rightfully allot space to the description of any outstanding service to the cause of Catholic education within the diocese. An annual necrology recording the names of former teachers who died within the term reported is some slight expression of gratitude for the dedication of a life to the instruction of the young. The report of the superintendent provides a place for the presentation of any new development of a progressive and permanent character in the diocesan educational facilities. The mere physical side of education is not neglected. In this age of visual education, when he who runs does not have time to read, a few photographs of modern school buildings recently erected are the best proof of progress, the best guarantee of a continued support of Catholic education. The report of the superintendent of parish schools serves to exhibit educational conditions, progress and results in accord with the needs of publicity, produces the feeling of responsibility that most fully contributes to administrative ends, and finally keeps the system close to the hearts of the people who love and support it.

VI. CATHOLIC ACTION AND THE SODALITY

By JOHN K. SHARP

The Sodality of Our Lady was organized to increase the personal holiness of its members and to train them in charitable work for others. In other words, from its very beginning the Sodality was organized for Catholic action. Personal holiness is the more important. That is the reason why the Sodality has always striven to further personal piety among its members by urging their devotion to Christ and their imitation of Mary. But nowadays and in our active generation no Sodality is a success which is not engaged actively in the lay apostolate. By the lay apostolate we mean the organized help given by parishioners to their parish priest in his apostolic work for souls. The modern Sodality is insisting that all its members participate in charitable and apostolic work within their parish and diocese.

If, as a bare possibility, some may still be inclined to feel that the Sodality in adding temporal efforts to its spiritual objectives has departed from its ancient tradition, is even somewhat heterodox, we may reassure ourselves by recalling that the policy of Catholic action outlined above has the highest earthly sanction. The Jubilee message of His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, given to the Sodalists of the world, both men and women, on March 30, 1930, is most heartening in this regard. His address, quotation from part of which will follow immediately, was given at the conclusion of the memorable audience of the Roman Sodalities with the *Prima Primaria* at their head. Representing all the Sodalists of the world, they came to offer the homage of all on the occasion of his Sacerdotal Jubilee. He said to them in part:

“The thought of these magnificent forces of truth and goodness so exceptionally well prepared and directed, advancing to do battle in behalf of right and virtue, fills Us with joy; for We realize all that Our sons are able to bring, will bring and actually are bringing to the apostolate—to that apostolate to which the Pope has called them, to which all Our predecessors, back to the days of the first Apostles and the first dawn of Christianity, have ever invited the Christian laity.

"This participation of the laity in the Hierarchical Apostolate is multiform in its variety, efficacious by reason of its very variety, and more efficacious as the variety is more accessible. It is possible for all. Especially open to the coöperation of all is the apostolate of the word, of action, of edification, of life and of prayer—the latter the most easy, offered to all, the most accessible to all and, moreover, of all the most powerful, because to prayer are assured all the promises of God: 'Ask and you shall receive.' 'Seek and you shall find.'"

After referring to Sodalities as "precious auxiliaries of Catholic Action," the Holy Father continues:

"All can and all ought to coöperate, to help. All have the power to do so, because the forms of good are of every variety, and all who do good contribute something to the holy edifice, and concur in the spreading of the reign of Christ. This was the grand work of the first Apostles; it is the perennial work of all ages of Christianity, the work of the missionaries at the frontiers of the Faith and of civilization, of the new apostles within its boundaries—a work which shall continue until the coming of the eternal kingdom.

"Still remaining upon the knees of your Celestial Mother, you will find the way, the time, and the energy to take your place in those special squadrons—in those activities so providentially disposed for the common good at a time when the Hierarchy has so great need of the assistance of the faithful and of the laity.

"The world is truly tending ever more and more—especially in certain directions—towards what is actually pagan or of a paganizing nature. On the other hand, the forces of the Sacred Hierarchy have in so many places been diminished because of the tremendous upheavals that have occurred in the world. Hence, there is accentuated the urgent necessity of having the laity, no less than in the time of the Apostles, come to the aid of the Hierarchy.

"There should be no incompatibility in being a practical and active Catholic even to the extent of participation in that most proper collaboration of the laity of all the ages of Christianity with the Apostolic Hierarchy, and adhering at the same time to whatever concerns the true common welfare and the exercise of good citizenship."

So it is that the Church renews her life and brings forth from her treasures things both new and old. And Catholic action on the part of the Sodality is a practical application of that mighty and

bed-rock truth of Catholicism: the participation of the faithful, according as it is given them, in the very priesthood of Christ. It is by encouraging such lay participation that we make vital a practical truth that is needed today.

The preceding articles of this series have been dominated by this *motif*. In this concluding article we shall indicate the works of Catholic action that may be undertaken from the club room but completed outside it.

We have tried to show that such Sodality effort as we have indicated and as we have yet to outline supports all the works of a parish, spiritual as well as temporal, develops parish loyalty, and stimulates powerfully what has come to be called the Catholic sense. If all Directors and Sodalities were to follow this "Grand Vision" referred to in the Holy Father's message, if all our unmarried women were active members, the possibilities of achievement would be almost limitless.

But some further details may be of interest. One of the leaflets of the Queen's Work Press indicates some ways in which Sodalists can help the pastor. We summarize: *The Sodality can help the pastor*: (1) in preserving a vital Catholicity among Catholic children deprived of religious education in elementary and high schools, as well as among converts and those in danger of contracting mixed marriages; (2) in restoring to the practices of their faith the invalidly married and the fallen away Catholics; (3) in spreading knowledge of the faith among the non-Catholics of the parish, among inquirers about the Church, and in home and foreign missions; (4) in the spiritual care or social adjustment of the unemployed, the blind, the sick, the bed-ridden, newcomers, the non-English speaking, negroes and juvenile delinquents; (5) in deepening the faith by working for attendance at such activities as missions, Mass, the Sacraments, by distributing Catholic literature, by visiting Catholics in hospitals, orphanages, and homes, and by aiding Catholic parish social life; (6) in parish visiting; (7) in getting children into the parish school, paying off church debts and coöperating in civic and diocesan projects.

America's comparatively recent growth out of the class of a missionary country has naturally turned our eyes towards the mission fields. And here again the wonders that are being accomplished have

resulted from the happy union of priests, religious and laity working jointly. We referred to the Sodality's prayers for the missions and the remaining that is done from the club room. But much more can be done than that. There is the Catholic Medical Mission Board at 8-10 West Seventeenth Street, New York City,¹ whither medical samples and supplies can be sent after being collected from physicians' offices and drug stores at specified monthly dates. A Brooklyn Sodality has a list of nearly one hundred such points of call. Monthly an average of two or three barrels are collected in this way. The Sodality can also help those on the firing line by adopting a home or foreign missionary, a school or a catechist. A formal letter is sent, and a gift (such as clothes, books and toys) or financial contribution is regularly dispatched. By the exchange of letters personal contact is established. The mission bulletin board also keeps the idea alive. Finally, we need but refer to the axiom that "work for the missions is work for home." In illustration of mission work done nearer home we may cite the fact that a New York Sodality has adopted and visits monthly twenty orphaned children between the ages of six and fifteen.

The Catholic Literature Committee has many reasons to interest itself in the dissemination of books and magazines. Such literature defends religion, creates Catholic feeling and background, entertains wholesomely, strengthens Catholics in their faith, and enlightens outsiders. Not merely the spread of such literature may be aimed at but also its reading. We have already referred to the Sodality library in the club room. It can be affiliated easily with the Public Library, which will send fifty of its books monthly for circulation among the Sodality. The Sodality could also see that *The Catholic Encyclopedia* and the more important Catholic magazines such as *The Commonwealth*, *The Catholic World*, *America*, and the local Catholic newspaper are on file in the local public library, paying for the subscription if necessary. The Sodality may take care of a parish Book Rack, the ordering of pamphlets being left to the priest. The many splendid pamphlets published are most useful in the hands of our people. The rack should be well lighted, prominent, neat and clean, filled and frequently changed, and should

¹ Cfr. Rev. Edward F. Garesché, S.J., "Catholic Medical Missions," in *The Ecclesiastical Review*, November, 1930.

present a variety of booklets. A Belleville Sodality puts pamphlets in a large rack in the waiting room of its railroad station. A Washington Sodality distributes pamphlets in hospitals and jails. Some pamphlets can be left on trains, in the waiting rooms of doctors, etc. A remote but real step towards answering difficulties in the press would be writing up monthly in the parish bulletin all that pertains to the local Sodality's activities. Lists of books suitable for summer reading, as well as history and English readings from the Syllabus of Catholic high schools and colleges should be posted in the club room. They will be welcome to some of those who did not go so far as they might have in their formal studies.

Something can also be done by the Sodality in the way of stimulating interest in Catholic higher education for women. Scholarships for courses at commercial high schools and at colleges have been easily raised by active Sodality groups.

Many dioceses have Confraternities of Christian Doctrine, or groups of young women who teach religion in Sunday schools to Catholic children where no parochial schools exist and on weekday afternoons to Catholic children of the public schools. Many of these religion teachers are themselves public school teachers, and some are also Sodality members. The work is all-important, perhaps *the* work in the Church today. It should appeal to the Sodalist. Happy is the priest who has such a group to call upon. Their zeal can be made more effective if he gives them suggestions on aims and methods of teaching religion, and if he supervises and encourages such teaching. A Sodality group in the Mid-West did splendid work of this character in thirty-three rural schools in which they circulated religion charts and dolls with Mass vestments.

Girl Scout leadership is another of the works of Catholic action in which our young women might well be interested. The Sodality easily furnishes ideal leaders to those parishes where for lack of troops many Catholic children are in troops under non-Catholic guidance.

Successful summer outings for the under-privileged have also been conducted by Sodalists. In this way as many as three or four hundred children have been taken once a week from a big city parish for a day's outing at the beach, a visit to the aquarium, a pilgrimage to some church or shrine, etc.

Some Sodalists have taken public speaking courses and contribute more usefully to Sodality meetings. They are also available and eager to visit other Sodalities and describe what is done.

A word may well be said here of means for raising money for extraordinary Sodality expenses. Bridges are perhaps the most common. They may be held monthly or quarterly in the parish precincts, in members' homes, or in department stores and industrial offices which are coming more and more to place their premises at the disposal of groups of women. Waffle parties with the menu prepared and supplied free to the members who are allowed to assess one another an admission fee, and a parish supper run on the same plan, have been popular means of raising money. And we have heard of one Sodality that twice accepted the offer of a prominent mortician to pay fifty cents apiece to those who would visit his non-sectarian funeral parlors!

Wisely it seems Sodality unions and sectional conventions are being urged today. Both efforts would seem to offer splendid opportunity for the exchange of ideas among Sodalists, for strengthening the weaker groups, and for affording inspiration to all.

Many of the preceding suggestions may look indeed like a "large order." "Trouble makers," the thoughtless may say; "Apostles," the more thoughtful. Yet in either case, let us again admit it, care and effort on the priest's part are required. And let us not forget that the present Pope has called Sodalities "precious auxiliaries of Catholic Action." Obviously, the goal had better be *non multa sed multum*. And the suggestions are made with the proviso that not all can or should be attempted by any one Sodality. Just how many activities the Sodality should carry can be determined only by the method of trial and failure or success. But where common sense, high ideals and unflagging interest are maintained, there will be something accomplished, something gained. We have at least indicated in the six papers of which this is the last a wide range of subjects in which the priest has vital concerns, and in which the genuine and therefore active Sodality may laudably be interested. If for each one of the above-listed activities the large parish had but one capable and interested lay person, its influence would grow by leaps and bounds. As we read recently, for instance: "On the whole, experience has shown that once the students in our Catholic seats of

higher learning are brought to realize the great amount of good they can do in the line of apostolic endeavor, they will respond heartily and will soon cover every field of apostolic interest within their range. Through Catholic action they will come to have a better realization of the sublimer and the higher life than the mere satisfaction of personal aims and private ambitions.”²

Once again we would respectfully indicate the responsibility and the opportunity of the clergy in Sodality work. We have at hand an instrument ready for the accomplishment of a splendid spiritual and material work for the Catholic cause. But we will need first to create, albeit slowly and painfully, the tradition among the clergy and laity in general, that the Sodality is worthwhile, and that all our unmarried women should belong to it. And we will certainly succeed in this if determination and vision direct us.

² W. H. Russell, A.M., “Teaching Youth to Spread the Faith,” in *Thought* (September, 1930), 224 sq.

PROCEDURAL LAW OF THE CODE

By STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Possessory Actions or Remedies

A person who has a legitimate title to obtain the possession of a certain thing or the exercise of a certain right, may petition the court that he be granted the possession of such thing or the exercise of such right (Canon 1693).

In reference to corporeal things one must distinguish between proprietorship and possession. Generally speaking, the owner of a thing is also entitled to possession of the same; in fact, ownership without the right of possession, use and enjoyment of a thing is of no practical value. It seems that the right of possession as distinct from ownership was introduced by the laws of the ancient Roman Empire. Very likely the occasion for a right of possession was given by the fact that the Romans had certain public lands (usually those of conquered nations) over which the State assumed ownership and distributed portions of those lands to the soldiers and their families. Portions of it were also given for use and cultivation to citizens who applied to the government for the use of the public lands. Each one could get as much as he could reasonably cultivate, and in sign of having taken possession each one's portion of the public land was staked off. The State reserved the right to revoke the right to the use of the land at any time. The grant of the use of the land, however, gave the grantee an exclusive right as to other citizens for the use of the property. In order that this right of possession could be defended against private individuals who might encroach upon another's right of possession, the Roman Law had to invent some kind of action in law by which the right could be protected and enforced. This was done by the so-called *interdicta*.

Jurists of the Roman Law developed the theory of the right of possession as a distinct legal right. Some of the principles or axioms established by them are: "Ownership has nothing in common with possession"; "Possession must be kept separate from ownership" (Ulpianus); "Possession and ownership must not be confounded" (Venuleius). Once the concept of possession as a legal right independent of ownership or title to the goods or property had been

established, the details of the requisites of that possession were evolved. Furthermore, the quasi-possession of rights was eventually admitted in the Roman Law in reference to servitudes or easements (*i. e.*, certain rights that one may have over the property of another, for instance, the right of way).

The Church adopted the Roman Law in her own affairs in all things in which it was suitable, and sometimes she used the Roman Law with modifications of her own. In the matter of legal possession she accepted the principles of the Roman Law and extended the concept of quasi-possession to offices, dignities, benefices, right of election, presentation, conferring of offices and benefices, rights of jurisdiction, etc. The Code of Canon Law follows the old Canon Law in the general concept of possession and quasi-possession, but adds some new rules to it, for example, the right of detention (*cfr.* Canon 1694), the rule that in the matter of prescription both as to the acquisition of rights and the liberation from obligations the laws of the respective nation are to be followed in the matter of ecclesiastical goods, saving the special rules of Canons 1509-1517.

Lega defines possession as follows: "Physical detention of a thing or some other relation to the thing considered in law equal to detention, by which a person exercises actually or habitually some activity concerning the thing, claiming the right to do so to the exclusion of others and not momentarily but for some time, to which detention the laws give juridical effect and protection." Two elements—actual possession and the mind or intention to hold it as of right—are considered the natural requisites of possession; the third—legal recognition and defense of such possession—completes the notion of legal possession. Possession may be had in good faith or in bad faith. If a person subjectively but honestly thinks that he has a right to possess a thing or exercise a right and believes that he is not thereby doing injury to another's rights, he is a possessor in good faith. The fact that one is a possessor in good faith does not prove that the possession in itself and objectively is just, as, for instance, when one believes one has the right to the possession of a thing and takes it by force or stealth from the possession of another. Even if such a man were entitled to possession, his method of getting possession makes it unjust in law. This is the common teaching of canonists. In the latter case where one by force or stealth gains

possession to which he is entitled, one should not call his possession unjust if he takes them from the thief or robber who deprived him of goods possessed by him, provided he acts promptly so that the thief or robber may not become the apparent rightful possessor. Public order demands that no private individual take things away from an apparently rightful possessor without the permission of the public authority.

If one has a legal right to the possession of a thing (*e. g.*, by contract, by legitimate appointment to an office) and the giving over of possession is refused, one may petition the court to force those who prevent possession to relinquish the thing to the petitioner. This is the first class of possessory actions, in which the plaintiff has not yet had possession; there are other actions for retaining possession against those who seek to disturb it, and actions for regaining possession when one has lost it.

RIGHT ACCRUING FROM SIMPLE DETENTION OF THINGS

Not only possession, but even the simple holding of goods or rights, entitles one, according to the following Canons, to a possessory action or exception (Canon 1694).

Simple detention, as distinguished from possession, is new in Canon Law. The Code does not explain what is meant by simple detention. Wernz-Vidal think that it must be a possession which in its natural condition (*i.e.*, without recognition by the law) deserves some consideration for the person who actually holds possession. Spoliators (*i.e.*, those who got possession by force or stealth) cannot urge possession as a legal right against the one whom they deprived of the possession of goods. That they can urge that possession against other persons and how far they may do so, will be seen when we come to discuss Canon 1696.

ACTION FOR THE RETENTION OF POSSESSION

A person who has remained for a full year in possession of a thing or in quasi-possession of a right, may take an action for the retaining of possession (*retinendæ possessionis*), if he is molested in the possession or quasi-possession. This action against the person who molests him in his possession or quasi-possession may be

brought only within one year from the time when he is first molested (Canon 1695).

The law grants to the possessor who has remained in possession for a full year the right to sue the one who molests him in his possession. With regard to the right to sue the disturber, it is immaterial whether the possession is, objectively speaking, just or unjust. The law desires that individuals act promptly in the defense of their rights; wherefore, if one has not taken action in court against the possessor but left him for a year in possession and then only begins to molest the possessor, the latter may get an injunction against the disturber, stopping him from interference with the possessor. That injunction must be applied for promptly in court, for it cannot be sought by the possessor except within a year from the time that he was first molested. In both the civil and the ecclesiastical law possession is held to be of such importance and the disturbance of it so detrimental to the common welfare that even persons possessing goods by robbery, theft, loan, deposit, finding of lost goods, etc., have certain rights, as will be seen from the following Canon.

The action for the retaining of possession may be brought by all persons who have actual possession, though it was obtained by force, or stealth, or is held precariously; it can be brought against any disturber of one's possession except the person from whom the possessor took the goods by force or stealth, or who gave him precarious possession. In cases which concern the public weal, the prosecutor has the right to raise the objection of faulty possession against one who holds possession through force or stealth or precariously (Canon 1696).

The law is not meant to protect robbers and thieves, but it seeks to uphold public order, and does not allow persons to invade the possession of another under the plea that he has robbed or stolen what he possesses. Against the rightful possessor the robber or thief has, of course, no remedy in law. The precarious possession means possession of goods and rights in the name of and at the pleasure of the rightful possessor. If one gives to another possession and use of goods to be returned on demand, so that the one who borrows the goods has no legal right or title to possession, that possession is called precarious. Such possession can be defended in court against all disturbers except the person who loaned the goods.

CONTROVERTED POSSESSION

If a controversy arises as to which of two parties is the possessor, that one is to be preferred who within the preceding year exercised the more frequent and important acts of possession. If that remains doubtful, the judge should attribute to both joint and undivided possession. If that is not possible because of the nature of the object or the right or because of the danger of disputes and quarrels, the judge shall order that possession be held by a *sequester*, or that the quasi-possession of a right be suspended, until the petitory action is decided (Canon 1697).

A plaintiff who attacks the actual possessor, claiming that the defendant should be made to cede possession to him, must prove his right of possession. If he does not prove his right to the court, the sentence must be in favor of the defendant (cfr. Canon 1748). If the defendant not only denies the claim of the plaintiff as to the right of possession but answers that he is the rightful possessor, the defendant becomes plaintiff in so far as he has the burden of proof for his contention. If the court judges that neither plaintiff nor defendant have sufficiently proved the right to the possession of the thing in controversy, the law directs that possession is to be adjudged to the one who within the preceding year has exercised the more frequent and important acts of possession. If that also remains doubtful, the judge is commanded by the Code to give plaintiff and defendant joint and undivided possession. The nature of the object or right in controversy may not permit of joint possession, or, while such possession is possible, it may be foreseen that much strife and dispute will ensue. In that event the court must appoint a receiver, who shall have possession by order of the court until the right or title to the thing has been decided in the so-called petitory action.

In cases that concern the public weal, the prosecutor of the diocese can intervene when the possessor brings action for the retaining of possession if he possesses goods through force, stealth, or precariously. Ordinarily nobody can raise objection to the right of possession of the plaintiff in his suit for the retention of possession except the person who was deprived of possession by that plaintiff. In questions of possession of ecclesiastical benefices and offices and the property and rights attached to them, the official defender of

justice—the diocesan prosecutor—has undoubtedly the right to intervene because of the public nature of object in controversy (cfr. Canon 1696).

ACTIONS FOR THE REGAINING OF POSSESSION

A person who has been deprived of possession of an object or of quasi-possession of a right in any manner by force or stealth, has a right to bring action to regain possession, or an action *de spolio*, or an exception *de spolio*, against the author of the spoliation or against the actual detainer of the thing or right. The action is not admitted after the lapse of one year from the time when the party deprived of the possession had notice of the deprivation; the exception *de spolio*, however, is perpetual (Canon 1698).

In the law of the Roman Empire there was an action “Unde vi” conceded to the person who had by force been deprived of the possession of immovable property, but the action was granted only against the party who had by force despoiled another of possession of real property. The Canon Law extended the action, granting the right to sue not only the spoliator but also others who in bad faith had acquired the goods from the spoliator. The Code goes further and extends the right so that one may sue even persons who in good faith have acquired property or rights from the spoliator. Moreover, the Roman Law granted the action for regaining of possession only in cases of deprivation by force, whereas the Code of Canon Law extends it to deprivation by stealth.

The action for the regaining of possession must be brought within one year from the time when the plaintiff has notice of the deprivation of his goods or rights; he has no right of action after the lapse of one year. One is not forbidden to repel an invader of one’s goods or rights, and one may use force against force in defense of one’s private right; but when one has not repelled the invader in the act and he has obtained possession, one must appeal to the authority of the court and do so promptly, at least within a year from the time when one gets notice of the invasion of one’s property or rights; otherwise one will not be heard. The Code says that the exception *de spolio* can be brought any time, no matter how long a time has elapsed since the spoliation occurred. If the party who deprived another of goods or rights by force or stealth should at any

time sue him whom he deprived concerning those goods or rights, the defendant has the right to object that he was by force or stealth deprived of the goods or rights. That objection excuses him from answering the petition of the plaintiff, and, if he succeeds in proving the spoliation, the judge must first reinstate the defendant in possession before he can be forced by the court to answer any other claim that the plaintiff may have concerning those goods or rights. This is explicitly stated in Canon 1699, §§ 1-2, which reads: "If the person who was deprived of possession is sued by the person who who deprived him, he may cite the exception of spoliation, and, once he has proved the spoliation, he is not bound to make further answer in the case until he has first been put into possession. The party who was deprived of possession need not prove anything else than the spoliation itself in order to regain possession."

DISCRETIONARY POWER OF COURT IN ACTIONS FOR REGAINING OF POSSESSION

Though the person deprived of possession, when brought to court, has the right to be reinstated in possession before the case proceeds, still the judge may at the instance of the other party or of the prosecutor decree that the reinstatement into the former condition be suspended, or that the object or person be put in custody of a *sequester* until the end of the trial of the case, if there is danger in the restitution of an object or of a right—for example, danger of cruel treatment if the husband demand against his wife the resumption of conjugal relations (Canon 1699, § 3).

If a plaintiff claims ownership of goods and the defendant raises the objection that he was deprived by force or stealth of the possession of those goods, the judge would ordinarily be bound to suspend the trial until he has reinstated the defendant in the possession of the goods and awarded damages for the injury caused by the deprivation of possession. However, Canon 1699, §3, gives him discretionary power to suspend the reinstatement and either leave things in the present state or put the property into the hands of a custodian, if he judges that there is danger to the property in the hands of the defendant. In marriage cases in which one party complains that he has been illegally deprived of the companionship and cohabitation of the other and insists on the reinstatement of

conjugal life, the court may for reason of spiritual or physical danger to the other party suspend the resumption of conjugal life, and, in case of the wife objecting to return to conjugal life, give her in custody of a person appointed by the court.

FORMALITIES OF THE POSSESSORY ACTIONS

Possessory trials are to be conducted by summoning only the adverse party, if the trial is instituted for the purpose of retaining or regaining of possession; in actions for the acquisition of possession (which the plaintiff never had) all who are interested in the matter must be summoned (Canon 1700).

The party who has been deprived of property or rights by force or stealth sues the spoliator or, at his choice, the person who now possesses the goods. If he sues the actual possessor who has received the goods from the spoliator, he need not make the spoliator a co-defendant; it suffices that he proves spoliation. The actual possessor cannot resist the order of the court to return the goods to the one deprived of them because he bought them in good faith from the spoliator; such a plea is no defense. He has, however, the right to sue the spoliator.

The person despoiled of possession by force or stealth may, instead of the possessory action, bring suit to prove title or ownership, and thus get a decision of the court on both possession and title. However, if he fails in proving title to the goods or rights in question, he may before the case is concluded return to the possessory action and vindicate his right of possession *cfr.* Canon 1671). He may also from the beginning of the action sue both for possession and for title. Canon 1671 empowers the judge to settle both questions either in one sentence or, at his discretion, by ruling first on the one and then on the other.

The spoliator himself can defend the actual possession in which he is disturbed against all persons except the party from whom he robbed or stole the goods. If the spoliator sues for the title to the property which he took by force or stealth, the person who was deprived of possession can stop his suit for title by the exception of the spoliation, and only after possession has been given to the rightful possessor can the action for title continue. The Code states that

no other persons are to be made parties to the suit except the adverse party contesting the claim for retaining or regaining possession. If there is a suit for the acquisition of possession by a plaintiff who never had possession but claims the right to it, all parties who have an interest in the goods or rights in question must be made parties to the trial. The Code does not mean to say that nobody is to be summoned to the trial (*e.g.*, witnesses who may be numerous in any possessory action), but it speaks of the parties to the trial, plaintiffs and defendants.

LITURGICAL NOTES

By THE BENEDICTINE MONKS OF BUCKFAST ABBEY

IX. The Feast of the Most Holy Trinity

I. THE WORSHIP OF THE BLESSED TRINITY IN THE EARLY CHURCH

The solemnity of today is the feast of time and eternity inasmuch as the love and contemplation of the Divine Majesty is the purpose of our existence both here and hereafter. Even as the temple of heaven resounds with the ceaseless echoes of the Cherubs' "Holy! Holy! Holy!" so is the worship of the Trinity the foremost care of the Church on earth. In the discharge of this duty the Church is not content with what she may achieve in the daytime, but she even encroaches upon the silent hours of the night, not afraid to break into the time needed for repose, in order to praise the adorable Trinity:

Tu Trinitatis Unitas

May the dread Three in One, Who
sways

Orbem potenter quæ regis

All with this sovereign might,

Attende laudis canticum

Accept from us this hymn of praise,

Quod excubantes psallimus.

His watchers in the night.

Nam lectulo consurgimus

For in the night, when all is still,

Noctis quieto tempore,

We spurn our bed and rise,

Ut flagitemus omnium

To find the balm for ghostly ill

A te medelam vulnerum.

His bounteous hand supplies.

(Cardinal Newman's translation.)

The worship of the Holy Trinity is made up of wonderment and awe. Nothing is so attractive as the mysterious; it charms us by its very obscurity and creates in man the unique emotion of wonderment and awe. The heart of man is alone capable of this exquisite feeling. An animal, when confronted with something it has not hitherto experienced, is afraid. When man is face to face with something new, he *wonders*. Here is something for him to explore, to investigate, and the finding out of truth is the most delightful experience as it is the noblest activity of a rational being. But we can only really wonder and experience a feeling of awe

when in presence of something big—something that, though known by us in part, still refuses to yield the full secret of its being. Hence, the normal man looks up to the starry sky with wonder, and when he reads what astronomers can tell about the size, distance and number of those bright worlds, wonder yields to awe.

In the supernatural order also wonder and awe have their place—in fact, even more so than in the natural, for here we are caught up into a world which is God's very own, and for that reason infinitely beyond our grasp. Mystery is inseparable from a truly divine religion, precisely because it is divine, for by its very definition it is the manifestation of an infinite to a finite mind and the expression of the ineffable in human phraseology.

Greatest or deepest among the mysteries of our religion is the dogma of the Blessed Trinity. It is likewise the most attractive and the most fascinating—if the epithet be permissible when applied to so august a supernatural fact—by reason of its very obscurity. The unknowable, the unfathomable invites contemplation, because there is always room for fresh discoveries. Moreover, this mystery is the starting point and the terminus of our whole being, for God is our beginning and our end, and God is Three as well as One. The supernatural order is based upon the divine nature and an overflow, as it were, of God's superabundant vitality. Hence, there exists a necessary interdependence between the life of time and that of eternity. Eternal life is essentially one—though there are two phases in its development, namely, grace and glory, and glory is but the full unfolding, under the radiant smile of the everlasting Sun of Justice, of the potentialities contained in grace as in their germ. When Our Lord described some of the effects of the Living Bread that He promised to give to men, He declared that "he that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, *hath everlasting life*" (John, vi. 55) even here and now, and not only as something to which he may look forward with hope and longing. Now, on Christ's own authority the essence of eternal life is manifestly within the reach of all who are in a state of grace, for "this is eternal life, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent" (John, xvii. 3).

The real life of the faithful—their supernatural life—is, there-

fore, a life in union with the Blessed Trinity, an existence lived in relation to the three Divine Persons. Hence it follows that the whole of the Church's Liturgy is the worship of the Blessed Trinity. During many centuries the Church did not deem it necessary to institute a special feast in honor of the basic tenet of her teaching, all the more so as every Sunday, being the Lord's Day, is essentially and naturally a festival of the Trinity. Moreover, at every one of the Hours of the Office homage is paid again and again to the Blessed Trinity. From the days of Pope Damasus (A.D. 366-384), every Psalm ends with an express act of homage to the three Divine Persons. There is no ritual blessing given and hardly a Sacrament administered unless it be in the name of the Blessed Trinity. When we come into the world we are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and at our leaving this earth the Church bids us depart "in the name of the Father who made you, in the name of the Son who redeemed you, in the name of the Holy Ghost who sanctified you."

Why is it, then, that several centuries were allowed to go by before the Church instituted a Feast of the Blessed Trinity, and how is it that only within very recent years has the feast been given the solemnity which now marks it?

The reason is twofold: first, there is the one hinted at above, namely, that each Sunday is in a sense dedicated to the worship of this mystery; secondly (and this is the chief explanation), for a very long time the Church only instituted feasts destined to commemorate some concrete, tangible event—some occurrence, that is, belonging indeed to the divine order of things but having a direct reference to our world, such as the feasts of Easter and Pentecost, the birth, passion and death of Christ, and so forth. Thus, even the institution of the Holy Eucharist was long deemed sufficiently honored by the solemn rites of Maundy Thursday. If this is true of a mystery that plays so important a rôle in the daily life of the faithful, there is little cause for wonder that the Church should have delayed fixing a special day on which to celebrate the most ancient and most abstruse of all mysteries until the time when the more concrete facts or events in the divine dispensation had each their appointed day in the liturgical calendar.

II. ORIGIN OF THE FEAST

It would seem that we have to trace back to the famous Alcuin the origins of an official and specific celebration of the mystery of the Trinity. This famous Yorkshireman of the eighth century, whose encyclopedic learning caused him to be summoned to the court of Charlemagne, composed (among other works) a *Sacramentary*—not, as has been asserted, for public use in church, but for private devotion. The book consists of texts of Masses suitable for such days as were without proper Masses. First among these liturgical compositions is a *Missa de Sancta Trinitate*, Sunday being the day assigned to it. Saturday has a Mass in honor of our Blessed Lady. These two Masses are the most remarkable of the whole series, and their value and interest are greatly enhanced for us in that, for the most part, the texts are not so much personal compositions of Alcuin as extracts or survivals from liturgical documents or compilations now lost to us. In the letter to the Monks of Fulda which accompanied the book, Alcuin writes: “*Missas quoque aliquas de nostro tali missali, ad quotidiana, et ecclesiasticæ consuetudinis*” (*Ep. cxlii, ad Fuld.*). In fact, the text of Alcuin’s Mass includes the Collect, Secret and Postcommunion and the proper Preface in use today.

It would take too long to examine in detail the vicissitudes of the great solemnity. From what has just been said of Alcuin’s liturgical activities we gather that before him there were in existence certain texts which he made use of in the composition of his Mass. Thus, in the Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York in the first half of the eighth century, among the list of days on which the bishop gives a solemn blessing to the people during Mass the First Sunday after Pentecost is named under the title of Feast of the Most Holy Trinity, and already in the year 700 the Church of St. Peter of Chartres possessed a complete Mass of the Blessed Trinity. John of Avranches, in his book on ecclesiastical offices, writes as follows (cfr. Martène, “*De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.*,” lib. IV, cap. xxii): “*Proxima dominica (viz., post Pentec.) cum novem psalmis et antiphonis, cum novem lectionibus et responsoriis celebratur in honore sanctæ Trinitatis eadem celsitudine qua dies Ascensionis*” (On the following Sunday—First after Pentecost—let the Feast of the Holy Trinity be kept, with nine Psalms and antiphons,

nine lessons and responsories, with the same solemnity as the Ascension).

An interesting allusion to the Office of the Holy Trinity is found in the Life of John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1290. Among other written monuments he left an Office of the Most Holy Trinity which, small as it is in size, is most remarkable by reason of the depth of thought and the dignity of the style that distinguish it. The Supreme Pontiff approved this office, and it was read and sung in all the churches which followed the Roman use in the celebration of the Canonical Hours, although, because of the difficulty of the work, the bulk of the smaller churches did not adopt it (Martène, *op. cit.*, *ibid.*).

The feast spread rapidly over the Western Church and soon became one of the most popular days of the Calendar of the Church. However, it was only in 1334 that Pope John XXI finally established it and extended it to the whole Church. It was reserved to Pius X to add the finishing touches to our sweet solemnity by raising the feast to the dignity of a double of the first class.

III. THE MASS OF THE FEAST

The Mass of Trinity Sunday is of rare beauty. The Introit, like that of the Sunday within the Octave of the Epiphany (*In excelso throno*, etc.) and the Introit of Requiem Masses, is not taken from the inspired Books of the Bible—at least not in its entirety. The first phrase is an act of faith in and praise of the Trinity of Persons and unity of nature; the second phrase is based on Tobias, xii. 6, and in fact the whole antiphon is inspired by the words addressed by the Angel Raphael to the elder Tobias and his son: "Bless ye the God of heaven, give glory to him . . . because He hath shown His mercy to you."

The first prayer, appropriate as it is, falls far short of the terseness and harmonious rhythm which distinguish the Collects of the classic period of liturgical composition. From this point of view the Postcommunion, and still more the Secret, conform to the traditional style; the Secret, in particular, ends with a clause which is found, for instance, in the Secret of the Monday after Whitsunday, the whole of which seems to have inspired our prayer, as a comparison of the two texts will show: "Propitius, Domine, hæc

dona sanctifica, et hostiæ spiritalis oblatione suscepta, nosmetipsos tibi perface munus æternum" (Fer. II. p. Pentec.).

The Epistle is a short extract from St. Paul's Letter to the Romans. It forms an admirable expression of the feeling of awe and reverence united to love and worship which fill the heart of him who strives to plumb the depths of the inner life of the Godhead. Learned by heart, the few lines might well become the habitual expression of our homage to the Triune God, as well as a most efficacious antidote against the shallow thought concerning the Deity which is so alarming a symptom of modern times.

In the Gospel we hear the last words that fell from the lips of Jesus in the very act of His departure from this world. It is impossible to listen to His solemn revelation of the Divine Trinity without experiencing something of the emotion felt by the chosen band that surrounded the Master in that momentous hour. In the instant of His leaving it, He asserts that He is the sovereign Lord of the earth; and not of the earth only but of heaven also; and this not solely as the Eternal Word, but as Man also. To the Man Jesus all things are subject because, in the incarnation, His humanity has been caught up into the very fullness of the divine life, His human nature and the glorious Word uttered ere the day star began to shine forming but one adorable Person. By His command the Three Divine Persons must be expressly named in the administration of the rite by which we too are incorporated in Him and are thereby made sons of God not merely by an external appellation, but in reality and truth: "*Ut filii Dei nominemur et simus*" (I John, iii. 1.).

The Offertory and Postcommunion are both based on Tobias, xii. 6. To the text of the Mass we may apply what Fr. Faber says of the Office of the Feast of the Blessed Trinity, namely, that it is distinguished by a certain simplicity, not to say by a kind of naïve and childlike wonder and admiration. As a child, when in presence of a thing that gives it pleasure, vents its joy by a series of inarticulate cries, by smiles and gestures, so does the Church express her love and worship by the repetition of practically the same ideas which, though but slightly varied in their utterance, do not weary just because they are the only possible attitude in presence of so sublime a mystery. "In truth," says Fr. Faber, "the mystery of

the Holy Trinity should be spoken of with tears rather than with words. We believe, yet we cannot describe. We adore, yet we can never comprehend. . . . It is just all this which makes the most Holy Trinity a mystery of such indescribable tenderness. At once and in the face of this august mystery we are children, happy, hushed and awestricken. The very Church amazes us by the childlike character of her offices on the feast of this mystery, by her constant, simple cry all day long: *O Beata Trinitas! O Beata Trinitas!*" ("The Blessed Sacrament," Book III, p. 239). It is, perhaps, in this third book of his work on the Holy Eucharist that the saintly Oratorian is at his very best, and when he is that, Faber is very good indeed.

A practical fruit of a devout celebration of the feast should be an enhanced reverence for all that belongs even remotely to the divine service and greater exactness and dignity in the carrying out of rubrics and ceremonies. If we really think of the stupendous mystery of the Godhead, one and three (as we make the sign of the cross, for instance, or when we say the *Gloria Patri*), there will be far less routine and offhandedness in these oft-recurring acts of worship and a more genuine spirit of faith and prayer.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

CIVIL LAW IMPEDIMENT OF AGE IN REFERENCE TO VALIDITY OF MARRIAGE IN CANON LAW

Question: (1) If two unbaptized persons, one of whom is under the legal age required by the civil law, get married *in fraudem legis*, and the same marriage is afterwards annulled because of defect of age, how is that marriage considered in Canon Law? For either through the intended marriage of one of such parties to a Catholic or through his conversion to the Catholic Faith, the marriage may come before the matrimonial court of the Church.

(2) If one or both parties were baptized non-Catholics and one of them was under the legal age set by the civil law, and this couple gets married *in fraudem legis* and the same marriage is annulled on the ground of lack of required age, is that marriage valid?

(3) If in these cases the parties do not have the age required by Canon Law (sixteen years for the boy, fourteen for the girl), is the marriage valid?

SACERDOS.

Answer: In the case of unbaptized persons marrying in spite of a civil law impediment, two questions arise: first, whether the State has authority to make laws that impede or invalidate the marriage of unbaptized persons, and, secondly, whether the civil law merely forbids or actually annuls marriage contracted in spite of the prohibition of the law. Catholic theologians are not agreed on the question whether the civil authority has power to make laws that annul the marriage of unbaptized persons contracting marriage in spite of such a law. The greater number of authors who have written on this matter are of the opinion that the civil authority has that power, and the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda has followed that opinion. The one serious objection to admitting that power in the hands of the civil authority is the fact that marriage even among unbaptized persons is of its very nature a sacred contract, and is beyond the scope of the civil authority, whose power is limited to the temporal affairs of its subjects. However, the unbaptized have no other authority to take care of the marriage contract and relation; wherefore, it is certainly the will of God that the legitimate civil authority should make reasonable laws and regulations in the same manner as the Church does for Christians.

Whether the State actually has established diriment impediments,

or whether it has merely prohibited marriage under certain circumstances, is a matter of fact which must be learned from the laws of the State where the marriage was contracted. In the United States there is the autonomy of each State to be considered, the legislature of each State being independent of every other State and of the Federal Government in the matter of marriage legislation. Some of the States make the required age of the parties to a marriage a real diriment impediment, declaring the marriage contracted in spite of the impediment null and void; other States make the marriage only voidable for lack of the required age. If two unbaptized parties marry and one or both are below the required age for the validity of the marriage, the marriage is null and void and would be considered invalid also by the Church, if ever that marriage comes before her. If the law of the State makes the marriage voidable only, the State will declare the marriage null and void when it is brought to court. The Church, we believe, cannot recognize the dissolution of that marriage if it ever comes before her courts, for once a marriage of unbaptized persons is valid under the natural law and the laws of the State, no civil authority can dissolve that natural bond. The indissolubility of the natural bond of marriage is firmly established by Christ: "*Quod Deus coniunxit, homo non separet.*"

If one or both parties to a marriage are baptized non-Catholics, the law of the State concerning the age of the parties cannot invalidate the marriage, nor can any other invalidating impediment of the civil authority render such a marriage null and void, for the marriage of Christians is exclusively governed by the rules of the Church both as to its validity and its licitness. Even if one of the parties is unbaptized and the other baptized, the rules of the Church must prevail, for in the conflict of jurisdiction—one being subject to the State only in the matter of marriage, the other to the Church—the authority of the higher, the spiritual order, must decide whether the marriage is or is not valid.

The third question of our correspondent has been answered already in the above explanations. If those marriages come into the matrimonial courts of the Church, the court will inquire whether the marriage of two unbaptized persons was null and void under the law of the State where the marriage was entered into, and, if

found invalid by the law of the State, will judge it invalid in her own court. In marriages between baptized non-Catholics and marriages between an unbaptized person and a baptized one, the Church does not admit invalidating laws of the State unless they be merely a restatement of the divine-natural law that incapacitates certain persons from contracting marriage.

SOME RUBRICS CONCERNING HOLY COMMUNION AND VESTING OF PRIEST FOR MASS

Question: (1) What is the precise meaning of the words which the Roman Ritual uses when speaking of the distribution of Holy Communion: "Vasculoque uno vel pluribus, decenti ac commodo loco expositis, cum vino et aqua ad purificationem eorum qui communicant"?

(2) Does the rubric contained in "Ritus in Celebratione Missae," n. 2, oblige in conscience: "Induat se, si sit prælatus secularis, supra Rochettum, si sit prælatus regularis vel alius sacerdos sæcularis, supra superpelliceum, si commode haberi potest"?

PAROCHUS.

Answer: The rubric is a reminder of the custom of former times when the people after having received Holy Communion did purify the mouth with a sip of the mixture of wine and water out of one or several large cups placed near the communion rail. Of this custom Gasparri (*De SS. Eucharistia*, II, n. 1184) says that it has gone out of usage in the ordinary Communion, even in the City of Rome (*vidente et tacente auctoritate ecclesiastica*), except in the Ordination Mass.

The rochet and the surplice are the clerical garb (besides the cassock) for the prelates and the clergy in all liturgical functions. The rochet, as historians of liturgical vestiture point out, was used by prelates even outside the functions of the Sacred Liturgy. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Roman *Pontificalia* mention the surplice as liturgical dress of clerics. The first known source which speaks of an investiture of the young men received into the clergy with the surplice is the *Pontificale* of Sens, France (beginning of the thirteenth century). The rochet, shorter and with narrower sleeves than the surplice, was a white tunic worn by all clerics in daily life over the cassock; it was considered, not a sacred vestment, but part of the clerical garb. From the earliest references to the rochet it appears to have been a long white tunic reaching

to the ankles, but it was later on shortened, even more than the surplice. It became the distinctive surplice of the bishops and other prelates at Rome, and later on also of those in other places. Regulations were passed for the wearing of the rochet or the surplice when vesting for liturgical functions, and that practice once established entered into the rubrics of the Roman Missal. As to the obligation of the rubric, it is evident from the wording of the same, "si commode haberi potest," that no strict obligation is imposed by it. In fact, we have never seen any priest in the United States wearing the alb over a surplice, and we have not heard of any doing so.

VALIDATION OF A CERTAIN MARRIAGE

Question: Anna, a Baptist, marries John, a baptized Catholic brought up without any religion, before a judge. Later, Anna takes instruction and wishes to become a Catholic. The question of her marriage to John comes up. Was it a valid marriage, or was John bound by the laws of the Catholic Church concerning the form of marriage? Canon 1099, §2, exempts only children born of non-Catholics baptized in the Catholic Church but raised from infancy in heresy, schism, or without any religion. John's mother was a Catholic, the father a non-Catholic; his mother died while John was an infant. There is no record of John's baptism, but his father always said that John was baptized a Catholic. John himself asserts that he is a Catholic, even though he knows nothing of the religious teachings of the Church and is indifferent, not caring to know. If I receive the woman into the Church, I must know whether or not their marriage needs validation.

PASTOR.

Answer: An authentic Declaration of the Committee for the Interpretation of the Code, July 20, 1929 (*Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXI, 573), ruled that the phrase in Canon 1099, §2 ("born of non-Catholics"), included children of mixed or disparate marriages, even though the marriage had been properly sanctioned by the Church with dispensation from mixed religion or disparity of cult. The marriage is, therefore, valid, because John was not bound to the Catholic form. The wife may be received into the Church though her husband has no religion. It should be explained to her that she will have the obligation as a Catholic to do all in her power to have her children baptized and raised as Catholics, not because of any promise (which is not required in this case), but because of her position as a Catholic mother.

CONCERNING ABSOLUTION OF MASONS

Question: A Catholic who became a Freemason wishes to return to the Church, abandon Masonry, and be absolved from the excommunication. The priest tells him that he must hand over all his insignia, documents or certificates, and in writing before two witnesses abjure Freemasonry. The man answers that he has no insignia, etc., because for seven years he has not in any way taken part in the affairs of the Masons, and had thrown away everything that reminded him of the secret order. He is willing to renounce Freemasonry before the priest and witnesses, but does not want to put it in writing. May the priest be satisfied with the oral renunciation and absolve him? It may be noted that in this mission the priests have the delegated faculty to absolve.

A priest is suddenly called to a Catholic who is dangerously ill. The man is conscious but rapidly sinking. He wishes to give up Freemasonry, and in the presence of his wife and children hands over all insignia, etc., and the priest hears his confession and absolves him. He dies almost immediately afterwards, and the priest gives him ecclesiastical burial. Is the priest right?

On another occasion the same priest found one of his parishioners who had joined the Masons unconscious and at the point of death. He gave him conditional absolution although the man had said just shortly before becoming unconscious that he did not want the priest. He did not give him ecclesiastical burial. Did the priest act correctly?

MISSIONARIUS.

Answer: It is wellknown that a Catholic who joins the Masons separates himself from his Church like one who joins some Protestant religious denomination. Masonry is not only a secret society but also a religious denomination, and the official teaching even of American Freemasonry is that their organization and that of the Catholic Church cannot stand together. Obviously so, for the principles and beliefs of Masonry vitally differ from those of the Catholic Church. If a Catholic who renounced his Church by joining the Masons wants to be readmitted, he must first of all admit that he did wrong and be sorry for having gravely sinned against God and His Church. As a proof of his sincerity of sorrow, he is required to give up the insignia and other things that are signs of membership in the Masonic sect, and he must also explicitly renounce his affiliation with the Masonic Order. The manner in which this renunciation is to be done should be learned from the form of the faculties of absolution which the priests may have. If no special form is prescribed, it is not necessary to demand a renunciation in writing. If Christian burial is to be given to one

who was known to belong to the Masons, it will be necessary that the members of the family and other people know that he returned to the Church, for it would be a scandal to the Catholic people of the parish to bury from the church a man who was known to be a Mason. If on account of circumstances it cannot be made known that a man returned to the Church, Christian burial should not be given him, even though he was absolved. The rules of the Church demand that, if time permits, the local Ordinary shall decide what is to be done in doubtful cases. Scandal must be avoided (cfr. Canon 1240, § 2).

In the second case, the man was evidently well disposed, and, even if his membership in the Masons was notorious, it should not be difficult to make his conversion sufficiently known so that scandal will be avoided in giving him ecclesiastical burial.

In the third case, the priest cannot help the man. It seems quite useless to give an unconscious dying person the Sacraments when as long as he was conscious he refused them. Even in the conditional granting of the Sacraments there should be some positive reason for judging that the man wanted the Sacraments, for without his will to receive them nobody should give them to him, as is evident. Here we have just the opposite—a determined will not to receive them. In the case of Catholics who have been fairly regular in the practice of their faith, one has at least a fairly good reason to suppose that the man wanted the Sacraments when he realized the danger to his life, and, if unconsciousness came suddenly upon him, we still can legitimately judge that he wants the Sacraments, for in our Church we have been taught frequently in life to ask the Saviour to grant us the grace of a happy death.

VICAR-GENERAL AND CHANCELLOR IN MISSIONARY COUNTRIES

Question: One of the Fathers from the missions in China writes to me about the article in the February issue, 1930 (page 517), concerning the offices of vicar-general and chancellor in Vicariates Apostolic. He says that the writer is unaware that the office of vicar-delegate, as distinct from that of pro-vicar, has been created by legislation subsequent to the Code. There seems to be ground for differing also with your writer when he says that in missionary districts there is no diocesan chancellor. Of course, there is no *diocesan* chancellor, but is it true that there is no chancellor? (Then the correspondent goes on to prove that the Vicar or Prefect Apostolic may appoint a chancellor).

SUPERIOR.

Answer: The Letter of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda to all Vicars and Prefects Apostolic, December 8, 1919 (*Acta Ap. Sedis*, XII, 120), states, in the first place, that the Vicars and Prefects Apostolic have not, according to Canon 198, the right to appoint a vicar-general, but that they have the right to appoint a delegate who may be a different person from the pro-vicar. Such a delegate would have those powers only which the Vicar or Prefect specifies in his appointment. In order that the Vicars and Prefects may have a man who, without specially enumerating the powers, would have all the faculties and jurisdiction of the Vicar or Prefect (similar to the vicar-general in common law dioceses), the Sacred Congregation authorizes the Vicars and Prefects Apostolic to appoint a priest as vicar-delegate, who practically enjoys the same jurisdiction as the Canon Law gives to vicars-general, and that vicar-delegate has the habitual faculty of executing papal rescripts and of making use of the special faculties which the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda grants to Vicars and Prefects Apostolic.

As to the chancellor in Vicariates and Prefectures Apostolic, our correspondent is right, we believe, and if in the article referred to we stressed *diocesan* chancellor too much, we wish to correct that impression. The Vicars and Prefects Apostolic certainly have the same rights and powers in their districts as the Ordinaries in their dioceses, unless the Code restricts them in some affairs. Nowhere does the Code of Canon Law in any way indicate that they cannot appoint a chancellor; on the contrary, Canon 304 prescribes that the laws of the Code concerning the archives which Ordinaries should establish apply also to Vicars and Prefects Apostolic as far as the circumstances of the missions permit. Now, one of the chief duties of the chancellor is the care of the diocesan archives.

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

CASUS MORALIS

Material Co-operator Held to Restitution

By LEO P. FOLEY, C.M., D.D.

Case.—Tyro, a young priest was asked for advice by Bertha, his parishioner, in the following case. Bertha had been employed as secretary to the president of a real estate company, who was treasurer likewise of an associated insurance firm. Bertha through her position was aware that her employer was withdrawing funds from the insurance business and, instead of investing them, diverting them to his personal use. In fact, she prepared the checks for his signature, kept the record of withdrawals for investments, and deposited the checks to his personal account, pursuant to his directions. On one occasion, when she expressed moral surprise, he said that he was temporarily pressed for money in his private investments and was only making a loan. So things went on until he had embezzled about \$100,000. Then Bertha reported the matter to the board of directors. They decided in the interest of the business not to make the defaulting public, and went no further than to ask the president to resign from his position and to turn over to the corporation his personal fortune, amounting to only a little over \$1,000. With Bertha they acted in like manner, agreeing not to prosecute her if she would do the same. She disposed of her property and in all transferred some \$15,000 to the corporation. Some months later Bertha, talking the matter over with a lawyer friend, learned that she could not have been held legally to any damage resulting from the embezzlement of her employer. The lawyer, too, offered to sue the directors for the recovery of her money, assuring her of a favorable outcome and promising to handle the case free. She had previously consulted a priest, Senex, who had told her that, since she had voluntarily surrendered the money, she could not in conscience seek to recover it. But now she goes to another priest, Tyro, for advice. Tyro advises her to accept the lawyer's proffer, assuring her that, if the courts decide in her favor, she may take the recovered money in good conscience. (1) What about Tyro's decision? (2) What about the decision of Senex?

Solution.—(1) The correctness of Tyro's decision depends on whether Bertha was justly or unjustly deprived of her personal fortune by the board of directors. In other words, whether her part in the crime of her employer binds her to restitution, or reparation of the damages the firm suffered from the dishonesty. She manifestly in no way profited by the theft, and therefore cannot be considered as possessor of another's goods. She coöperated negatively by her silence in concealing this matter for a considerable time. Is she held

to restitution on this ground? Not unless in accepting the position of secretary, she bound herself by contract, tacitly or expressly, to prevent such losses; and even then she might be excused from observing the contract by the grave inconvenience that such observance would entail. In her office of secretary to the president of a firm, there is no such contract; for the relation directly concerned that officer, to whom loyalty and service were due, but not to the firm as such. Any obligation to the firm would be an obligation of charity at most. An attempt on her part to protect the firm by injecting herself into its business would normally have resulted in her dismissal, seemingly a serious inconvenience. But what about her positive coöperation in writing out checks, recording withdrawals for investments, depositing those funds to her employer's account? We suppose, from her protest, that she was coöperating materially only (that is, in the external act), and at the same time that she was truly convinced of his intention as well as of his ability to return those withdrawals. Now, theologians hold that concurring remotely in the sins of one's employer is lawful for such a reason as keeping one's position. All that Bertha did was in the ordinary line of secretarial work—things not intrinsically evil in themselves, and things which could not be refused without danger of serious inconvenience. The evil or formal malice was in her employer's will to steal. In that she did not coöperate at all. For that reason she was unjustly deprived of her personal fortune to repair damages that she was not guilty of causing. She may, therefore, sue to recover her money.

(2) Senex was mistaken in judging that Bertha freely entered a contract in ceding her property in exchange for immunity from civil prosecution. Even supposing that she could have been prosecuted, the contract would have been rescindable at least, and probably invalid, for she was imposed on by being unduly frightened, if not essentially deceived. Under such duress and in view of the probable fraud, she did not enter a binding contract. It is hardly probable that she was willing to cede \$15,000 simply to keep the matter private, when her part in the transaction was not strictly dishonorable. Since the advice of her lawyer friend is perfectly in accord with the civil law's determination, she is acting not only justly but even prudently in allowing him to enter suit. The only thing that could deter her might be the fear of incurring notoriety or suspicion.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

INSTRUCTION OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE SACRAMENTS

To the Right Reverend Local Ordinaries regarding the Scrutiny of Alumni before They Are Promoted to Sacred Orders.

§ 1. *Regarding the Duty of Ordinaries to Scrutinize Sedulously the Character of Candidates before Ordination.*

1. What a great detriment to the Church and the salvation of souls is occasioned by those who without a divine vocation presume to enter the sacerdotal ministry—a formidable burden even for angelic shoulders—is palpable to all. Wherefore, to avert numerous and grave evils from the Church herself and the Christian faithful, those who have been placed by the Holy Spirit to rule the Church of God should take the most sedulous care to bar the entrance of so great a ministry from those to whom, on account of their lack of the sacerdotal vocation, should be applied the saying of Christ Our Lord: “Amen, Amen, I say to you: he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber” (John, x. 1).

This Sacred Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments, which in virtue of Canon 249, § 3, is competent in cases wherein there is question of the nullity of Sacred Ordination and of the burdens annexed to the same, has noticed in the investigation of these cases that the matter at issue very often concerns complaints about Ordination of priests who, although they cannot prove that they have been driven by force or grave fear to receive Sacred Orders, nevertheless from the evidence produced demonstrate plainly that they have been enlisted in the ranks of the clergy in an anomalous fashion, or that their vocation has not been sufficiently tested, and they have not received Sacred Orders with a free and spontaneous will. To eradicate so grave a disorder, this Congregation desires to insist again on what St. Paul recommended when writing to Timothy (v.22): “Impose not hands lightly upon any man; neither be partaker of other men’s sins.” The same is recorded and expounded more at length in the Code of Canon Law: “Let not the Bishop confer Sacred Orders on any one unless he is morally certain from positive arguments of his canonical fitness. Otherwise, not

only does he sin most gravely, but he even exposes himself to the danger of participating in the sins of another" (Canon 973, § 3).

2. In the first place, therefore, the Bishop should take account of the provisions of the existing law regarding the discipline of seminaries and of the other norms which it has heretofore pleased the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities to prescribe to the end that the alumni of seminaries may show themselves adorned with those qualities which are required today for the proper, holy and fruitful exercise of the sacerdotal ministry. To those provisions, moreover, should be added whatever Canon Law prescribes concerning not only irregularities but also the impediments to the reception of Sacred Orders, as commanded in Canons 983-987, and the other requisites which Canon 973 demands in the subject of Sacred Ordination.

3. To assure the proper execution of these provisions, the Bishop or Ordinary should, in scrutinizing the character of those who seek to be enlisted in the sacred ranks of the priesthood, keep steadily in view the utmost importance of barring from the very threshold and refusing Tonsure and Minor Orders to those who are not suited for the discharge of the sacerdotal ministry or have not been called by God. For Sacred Orders are conferred at the end of a course of studies; but "it is more shameful to be cast out than not to be admitted as a guest." Everyone indeed knows what a grave and difficult affair it is to dismiss a youth after he has almost finished his theological studies, not only because of his already advanced age (by reason of which no easy way is open to him to enter another mode of life and studies), but also out of respect for human relationships—especially with relatives and friends, who are wont to attribute such changes in the mode of life to a defect in or lightness of character, and therefore no stone is left unturned so that he may proceed further who has progressed so far.

4. Besides, as is made clear by the cases discussed before this Sacred Congregation concerning the nullity of Sacred Orders and annexed obligations, the examiners should keep in view the reasons which are commonly given by those asserting that they had not the true will to receive Holy Orders or at least to undertake the grave obligations annexed to Sacred Ordination. Some of these reasons are *internal* or *intrinsic* in the complainants, such as the desire to

enjoy the easier (according to common opinion) clerical life, to attain honors, to acquire riches more readily, or—and this is the most frequent reason of all—to escape manual labor (lest they be forced to dig and cultivate the fields with their parents and brothers or to pursue some similar mode of life), or to enjoy clerical privileges and especially exemption from military service or worldly occupation, or at least to acquire with the clerical state a higher station even in civil estimation. The reason *extrinsic* to the petition, and as it were the classical one in these cases, is grave fear, whether absolute or relative, such as reverential fear. Both species of fear, however, have been most minutely explained in Canon Law.

Wherefore, in order that the Right Reverend Local Ordinaries may more easily comply with the precepts of the Sacred Canons, this Sacred Congregation lays down the following norms respecting the method of the scrutiny and determining the sources from which the truth may be drawn. But it is not the intention of the Sacred Congregation that each and every investigation should be carried out in absolutely all cases without exception, since some of the inquiries are frequently superfluous or impossible; but that all the information that can be gathered or tested about the character of the Ordinands should be assembled before they may be safely advanced to Sacred Ordination.

5. The acts which are drawn up in these investigations should be kept in a secret archive of the Curia.

§ 2. *Concerning the Scrutiny to be Made before the Conferring of Tonsure and Minor Orders.*

1. When the time approaches for the candidates to receive first tonsure or Minor Orders, let them present at least two months beforehand a written petition to the Rector of the Seminary, signed and subscribed in their own hand, in which they should candidly signify that they are seeking first tonsure and subsequently Minor Orders wholly of their own free and spontaneous will.

2. Such a petition, to which testimony must be added of the reception of Baptism and Confirmation, shall be submitted by the Rector of the Seminary together with his personal information of the fitness of the petitioner for the clerical state to the Right Reverend Bishop, who will follow the norms described below, unless, in con-

sideration of the information of the same Rector and having perhaps before him other information known to him as certain, he shall decide that the aforesaid petition should be rejected forthwith.

3. If there be question of alumni dwelling in regional seminaries or in Italian or foreign ecclesiastical colleges, especially those in this sacred city, the Rector (unless he has habitually a special mandate from the Bishops of the alumni to investigate petitions of this kind according to the following norms, the distance of places being taken into consideration) shall take care that the petition submitted to him by the alumni shall be also transmitted, fortified with his own information, to their own Bishops.

4. In both cases, as is proper, the Ordinary shall return this petition to the same Rector of the Seminary with the mandate to investigate in his name and under his authority the fitness and qualities of the petitioner for the time he has been in the seminary.

If the Rector of the Seminary is absent and a Vice-Rector is taking his place, or if the Bishop thinks that the Rector is not the one who can institute a useful investigation in the case, he should refer the mandate of investigating to another.

5. The Rector of the Seminary will take care to seek most diligently for information regarding those to be promoted from the prefects of the alumni (especially if these be adorned with the sacerdotal dignity), as well as from those who exercise the office of professors in that Seminary. These he will hear not only separately but also together in convocation, namely, about the special signs of vocation such as piety, modesty, chastity, about their propensity for sacred functions, about their progress in studies, about good character, for which inquiries may serve the questionnaires given in the Appendix (Mod. II and III), *congrua congruis referendo*.

Whereas in Diocesan Seminaries there should be a board of deputies for maintaining discipline in accordance with Canon 1359, these also should be interrogated in the investigations if they are well acquainted with the candidates.

When the Rector of the Seminary transmits to the Bishop the information gathered in virtue of his mandate, he shall declare his judgment or manifest his opinion as based on this information regarding the character and dispositions of the candidate. A judgment of this kind will, indeed, have no little weight, because it is

presumed that the Rector, above all others, will render a correct judgment on the alumni.

6. To scrutinize the matter more closely in individual instances, however, the Bishop shall furthermore enjoin the pastor of the alumni and of their families to inquire sedulously not only regarding the signs of a vocation in those to be promoted, but also about their former and present manner of life; and he shall most of all inquire how they have conducted themselves during the holidays (whether, namely, they have shown a certain levity of mind or have engaged in profane affairs), and what is their public reputation (Mod. II). He shall inquire, moreover, whether the parents of the candidates enjoy a good reputation and what are their family conditions; whether for the sake of advantage or gain relatives are impelling reluctant candidates to enter the priesthood by importune persuasions, prayers or threats, or in any other way, fearing forsooth that some damage will accrue to the family if Sacred Ordination is declined. If these incitements or disorders be manifest, or there exist a prudent doubt about their existence, the Ordinary shall do his utmost quietly to dissuade them from proceeding further or, if the case warrants it, he shall strongly admonish the parents of the penalty of excommunication to be incurred *ipso facto* decreed by the Church against those who in any way force a person to receive Holy Orders (Canon 2352).

7. If the Pastor be related to the one to be promoted either by consanguinity or affinity, the Bishop shall take care to gather the information from another pastor or priest dwelling in the place; this takes place especially when the candidate is about to receive Sacred Orders, before the canonical publications are made, or when the same have been legitimately dispensed with in virtue of Canon 998. In order to avert evils which are wont to arise after the burdens of Sacred Ordination have been rashly undertaken, it is of no little value to inquire whether it may be rightly conjectured or suspected that some abnormality may have descended from the parents to the candidate, and especially whether he has a disposition towards lust which savors of atavism (Mod. II). This investigation every Bishop should take care to conduct for his own subjects.

8. Furthermore, let the Bishop ask the Rector of the Seminary and the Vice-Rector separately what they sincerely think of the can-

didates, if this can be done. This should take place after the information has been collected in virtue of his mandate by the same Rector.

Other persons of distinguished probity, whether ecclesiastical or lay, who can give special information regarding the candidates, should also be questioned according to Mod. III, if the Ordinary in view of the circumstances of things and persons thinks it opportune to question them, especially when there remains some doubt about the character and the canonical fitness of a candidate.

9. Nor is that enough; for the mind of the individual candidates will have to be more thoroughly explored by their own Bishop or, if he is impeded, by the Vicar-General, or under his orders by the Rector of the Seminary or even by those who are deputed for the maintenance of the discipline of the whole seminary. In the case of alumni dwelling in seminaries outside the diocese, the mandate for this can be referred to the Ordinary of the place of residence or some ecclesiastical dignitary, or to the Rector of the Seminary himself. For it is necessary, lest partiality deceive or affection err, that the Bishop test the will of the ordinands by himself or one of the mentioned persons, and that he should clearly know whether those to be promoted ask for Sacred Ordination under the pressure of the persuasions, supplications and promises of others, or even compelled and terrified by threats; whether also they are fully cognizant of the burdens to be undertaken by them, and especially of what the law of celibacy implies, and whether they are prepared to observe this fully and constantly with the help of divine grace, avoiding the dangers by opportune means, so that their conduct, as the Roman Pontifical reads, may be upright and pleasing to God and worthy of an increase of ecclesiastical honor. Whence, it will be expedient for the Bishop to read through for the candidates the words which are given in the Roman Pontifical and to explain them very accurately, namely, that those to be promoted should attentively consider again and again what a burden they seek; that before Sacred Ordination, since they are free, it is lawful for them freely to pass over to secular occupations; but after the reception of Sacred Orders they may no longer abandon their intention, but must serve God perpetually and observe chastity. Therefore, while there is time, let him exhort those to be promoted that they should consider zealous-

ly and before God (so that the Bishop may be informed), whether they seriously intend to persevere in a resolution of this kind and are prepared to keep the promises. With the kindest words and in a paternal manner, the Bishop will persuade them to open up candidly their minds to him, most confidently assuring them, if it be necessary, that he will gladly do his best to see that they shall enjoy due liberty; so that, lacking a true purpose in such a grave matter, they may secure another office for themselves more suited to their dispositions and character.

§ 3. *Concerning the Investigation to be Conducted before Clerics are Initiated into Major Orders.*

I. When it can be prudently inferred from the completed investigations that the petitioner may be admitted to theological studies, and that first tonsure and then Minor Orders may be conferred on him, consideration should be given to the Acts of the investigations preserved in the archives of the Curia, when the alumnus asks to be promoted to the subdeaconate. But the Bishop or Local Ordinary should attend not only to what has already been done but, before subdeaconship is conferred, he should again investigate the character of the candidate, observing the method already explained. As indeed it is superfluous to note, it is unnecessary to inquire again concerning the origin of the alumnus, his parents' character and disposition, and the earlier character of the alumnus, unless there has arisen a just suspicion that the information already acquired does not agree with the truth.

But it is always of interest to inquire of the character of the alumnus and his moral qualities, how namely these have been manifested by the life passed in the seminary and from his progress in studies. After these investigations have been completed, if there be no canonical reason which would urge that the alumnus be barred from subdeaconship, he must subscribe in his own hand and confirm under oath the declaration given in the Appendix (Mod. I), in which he attests that with complete liberty he seeks the Sacred Order, and that he has duly considered all the burdens annexed to the same. This declaration indeed will be similarly executed by the candidates before they are promoted to the remaining Sacred Orders, namely, the deaconship and the priesthood.

2. When there is question of conferring deaconship, it suffices for the most part to keep in view the investigations already made, unless in the meantime new circumstances have to be considered which would force one to doubt the sincere purpose of the candidate or his moral fitness to bear the burdens and to fulfill the obligations undertaken in Sacred Orders.

Perhaps a doubt of this kind which has arisen may have to be dispelled by instituting investigations, either opportune or necessary according to the above norms, depending on the character of the case. But if the matter has reached the point where it is clearly evident that the subdeacon to be promoted to deaconship either never actually had a sacred vocation or has lost it through corrupt morals, then the matter will have to be scrutinized more thoroughly, as we shall now say in connection with the promotion of a subdeacon to the deaconship and with the conferring of the Priesthood.

3. Before any one is initiated into the deaconship or priesthood, whenever the Bishop has convincing evidence from the admissions of the candidate, or from other certain indications and proofs received, that the latter is really destitute of a sacred vocation, let him not omit to approach the Holy See, relating candidly and fully the status of affairs or the arguments by which is supported the strong doubt about the fitness of the subdeacon or deacon to bear greater burdens worthily and faithfully. The matter is, indeed, of such great moment that the conscience of Ordinaries remains gravely burdened by this obligation, so that the danger may be removed of their imposing hands on a deacon or priest who is unable to sustain the very grave burden of Sacred Orders.

4. Lest the matter be brought to this extreme, however, let it be deeply imbedded in the mind of the Bishops and Local Ordinaries that it is of the utmost importance that those who are unworthy and not called should be kept away from the very threshold of Sacred Ordination. For when these have entered the sanctuary, to satisfy human cupidity or the will of another, they do not as a rule reveal their lack of a divine vocation, but are wont to cover up wholly their less worthy mode of acting or to practise simulation. There are others who have received Minor and Sacred Orders in good faith, but, before they attain the priesthood, discover that they are unable to sustain the burdens of Sacred Ordination, or have

immersed themselves in worldly vices or morals: in these doubtless the defect of a sacred vocation will be apparent more easily and openly, and moreover these same will request that their most miserable condition be provided for.

5. Wherefore, it is of the utmost importance that the prescribed norms be observed exactly and mostly diligently before Bishops admit candidates to the clerical ranks, or for this purpose send dismissorial letters to the Bishop of the place for their subjects dwelling in another diocese. Whence it will follow that those enrolled in Sacred Orders will become worthy dispensers of the mysteries of God, and greatly guard and promote on earth the kingdom of God to the benefit of the Catholic world and the civil state (December 27, 1930; *Acta Apost. Sedis*, XXIII, 120).

APPENDIX

Mod. I

Declaratio propria manu subscribenda a candidatis in singulis sacris Ordinibus suscipiendis, iuramento coram Ordinario præstito.

"Ego subsignatus N. N., cum petitionem Episcopo exhibuerim pro recipiendo subdiaconatus (seu diaconatus vel presbyteratus) Ordine, sacra instante Ordinatione, ac diligenter re perpensa coram Deo, iuramento interposito, testificor in primis, nulla me coactione seu vi, nec ullo impelli timore in recipiendo eodem sacro Ordine, sed ipsum sponte exoptare, ac lena liberaque voluntate eundem velle, cum experiar ac sentiam a Deo me esse revera vocatum.

"Fateor mihi plene esse cognita cuncta onera caeteraque ex eodem sacro Ordine dimanantia, quae sponte suspicere volo ac propono, eaque toto meae vitae curriculo, Deo opitulante, diligentissime servare constituo.

"Præcipue quae caelibatus lex importet clare me percipere ostendo, eamque libenter explere atque integre servare usque ad extremum, Deo adiutore, firmiter statuo.

"Denique sincera fide spondeo iugiter me fore, ad normam ss. Canonum, obtemperaturum obsequentissime iis omnibus, quae mei praecipient Praepositi, et Ecclesiae disciplina exiget, paratum virtutum exempla praebere sive opere sive sermone, adeo ut de tanti officii susceptione remunerari a Deo merear.

“Sic spondeo, sic voveo, sic iuro, sic me Deus adiuvet et haec Sancta Dei Evangelia, quae manibus meis tango.”

(Loco) . . . die . . . mensis . . . anni. . . .

MOD. II

Inquisitio ope Parochorum peragenda

Parochus in sua scripta relatione super his mentem suam aperiet :

1. Num clericus in explendis pietatis operibus, videlicet in piis peragendis commentationibus, in audienda Missa, in visitatione Ssmi Sacramenti atque in mariali rosario recitando sedulus et devotus exstet.

2. Num ad sacram Confessionem et ad sacram Synaxim crebro ac devote accedat.

3. Num diligenter ac pie in sacris functionibus suum ministerium expleat.

4. Num christianæ doctrinæ tradendæ, quatenus huic extra Seminarium addictus fuerit,¹ suam operam navet.

5. Num studium curamque prodat divinum provehendi cultum, animarum curandi bonum, atque ad sacra exercenda ministeria pro-
pensionem patefaciat.

6. Quibus speciatim intendat studiis, et qua sedulitate.

7. Num profanis perlegendis libris diariisque, odium contra fidem, vel bonos mores, foventibus, sit deditus.

8. Num autumnalibus feriis extra Seminarium clericali veste usus sit atque usatur.

9. Num prædictis feriis cum aliquibus utriusque sexus personis non bonæ famæ, aut etiam bonæ famæ sed cum scandalo et admiratione fidelium, si agatur de personis alterius sexus, familiaritatem foverit, vel loca frequentaverit haud suspicione carentia.

10. Num in loquendo probum ac integrum sese ostenderit.

11. Num occasionem præbuerit ut censoria nota afficeretur circa mores, vel Ecclesiæ doctrinam et præcepta.

12. Quomodo se gerat cum pueris, puellis aliisque diversi sexus personis.

¹ Priusquam vero candidatus ad ultteriores sacros Ordines promoveatur, si nondum præfato muneri addictus fuerit, addici debet.

13. Num se proclivem exhibeat ad vitæ commoda, ad copiosum hauriendum vinum, ad liquores sumendos, atque ad profana oblectamenta capienda.

14. Num caritatem ostendat, demissionemque atque obsequium iis qui præsunt, præbeat.

15. Quæ sit publica de ipsius vocatione opinio.

16. Num inter parentes alicuius infirmitatis indicia, ac præcipue mentis morumque pravorum, adsint, quæ atavismum suspicari sinant.

17. Num parentes vel alter e familia ipsum impellant ad sacerdotium ineundum.

MOD. III

Interrogatorium aliis personis probis proponendum

Quo autem facilius personæ probæ interrogationibus responsa præbeant, hæc ab ipsis erunt exquirenda :

1. An clericus sive in ecclesia sive in consuetudine cum aliis habenda, pie, graviter, prudenterque se gesserit ac gerat.

2. An aliquod de sua vocatione ad sacros Ordines foveri possit dubium, et qua ratione.

3. An parentes vel alter e familia ad eosdem suscipiendos sacros Ordines ipsum impellant.

4. An familiariter utatur cum iis qui in suspicionem veniant de fidei carentia vel de malis moribus.

5. Quæ sit publica et præcipue præstantiorum hominum existimatio de agendi ratione, tum morali tum religiosa, eiusdem clerici, et de eius vocatione ad sacerdotum ineundum.

TRANSFER OF EPISCOPAL SEE FROM LEAD TO RAPID CITY

At the request of His Excellency, the Right Rev. Bishop John J. Lawler, the Episcopal See of Lead, South Dakota, has been transferred to Rapid City in the same State, because of the easier access to that city and its greater facilities for reaching the various parts of the vast diocese. The Church of the Immaculate Conception at Rapid City is to be the Cathedral Church (Apostolic Constitution, August 1, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 113).

BOOKS PLACED ON THE INDEX

The book entitled "L'ami," by Rev. Martial Lekeux (Editions Saint-Michel, Paris), has been put on the Index of Forbidden Books (Holy Office, March 6, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 117).

Another book entitled "Het Volkomen Huwelijk" (Perfect Marriage), by Th. H. Van de Velde, M.D., has been put on the Index (Holy Office, March 14, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 117).

DECREE ON SEXUAL EDUCATION AND EUGENICS

(1) Can the method which is called sexual education of youth or also sexual initiation, be approved?

Answer: No, it cannot. On the contrary, the method in the education of youth employed until now by the Church and saintly men and recommended by His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, in his Encyclical of December 31, 1929, is absolutely to be followed. One must, first of all, give the young boys and girls a full, firm and unceasing training in religion. They are to be taught a high regard, desire and love for the angelic virtue; and, most of all, one should teach them to pray steadily, receive the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist frequently, practise a filial devotion to the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of holy purity, and put themselves entirely under her protection. They must be taught studiously to avoid dangerous reading, obscene shows, improper conversation and all dangers of sin. Wherefore, the writings that have in recent times been published, even by some Catholic authors, in defense of the new method can by no means be approved.

(2) What is to be thought of the so-called theory of eugenics, both positive and negative, and of the means indicated for the betterment of human offspring, disregarding the natural, divine and ecclesiastical laws of marriage and the rights of individuals?

Answer: The said theory is to be absolutely rejected and to be considered as false and condemned, as it is censured in the Encyclical "Casti connubii," of December 31, 1930 (Holy Office, March 21, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 118).

DECREE OF THE USE OF BLESSED BELLS

The Code of Canon Law prescribes that the use of blessed or consecrated bells be entirely in the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities (cfr. Canon 1169). The same Code further forbids that the blessed bells be used for profane purposes except in the case of necessity, or with the special permission of the Ordinary, or by legitimate custom (cfr. Canon 1169, §4).

As it has been reported to the Holy See that some pastors or rectors of churches, without consulting their Ordinary, too easily assent to or allow the use of their church bells for purely profane purposes, the Sacred Congregation reminds them of the precept of Canon 1169, §4, and desires them to observe it. The Ordinaries may insist on the law even with ecclesiastical penalties, and, if necessary, refer the matter to the Holy See (Sacred Congregation of the Council, March 20, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 129).

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS

The following have been made Prothonotaries Apostolic: the Rt. Rev. Msgri. Charles Ambrose Wheatley and James Dey (Archdiocese of Birmingham); Martin Howlett (Archdiocese of Westminster).

The following have been made Domestic Prelates to His Holiness: the Rt. Rev. Msgri. Winand Daniels, Robert B. Condon, Peter Pape (Diocese of La Crosse), James J. Bloomer, John F. Boppel, John Brophy, George V. Burns, Joseph S. Cameron (Diocese of Rochester), Joseph M. Perotti, Ignatius P. Szudrowicz (Diocese of Newark), James McManus, Thomas F. Connolly, and Patrick F. Cullen (Archdiocese of Wellington).

The Messrs. Hernand Behm and Sostenes Behm (Archdiocese of New York) have been made Knights Commanders of the Order of St. Gregory the Great; the Knighthood of the Order of St. Gregory the Great has been conferred on Messrs. Joseph Cadieux (Archdiocese of Montreal), Eugene J. Dwyer, Joseph H. Weis, Henry D'Annunzio, James P. B. Duffy, Vladislaus Wojtezak (Diocese of Rochester), John A. Cullen, and John Francis Smith (Diocese of Newark).

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Homiletic Part

Sermon Material for the Month of July

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Multiplication of the Loaves

By THE RIGHT REV. MSGR. VICTOR DAY, V.G.

"I have compassion on the multitude" (Mark, viii. 2).

SYNOPSIS: *Introduction: The fame of Jesus draws the multitude after Him into the wilderness; Christ performs the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes in the country of the Decapolis in sight of Jews and pagans.*

I. Story of the miracle.

II. Why Christ performed this miracle: (1) out of compassion; (2) to teach the lesson of charity; (3) to prepare the pagans for the Gospel; (4) to prepare men for the great mystery of the Eucharist.

Conclusion: Application to ourselves.

The multiplication of the loaves related in today's Gospel took place in the spring of the year 32. It occurred in the country of the Decapolis, a confederation of ten free cities which the Jews had not been able to subjugate after their return from the Captivity. The population of these cities was still largely pagan.

Jesus was remembered in this district as the prophet who, but a few months before, had expelled the devil from the possessed persons of Gergesa. The grateful beneficiaries of these miracles had broadcasted throughout the land the striking story of their deliverance from the evil one at the hands of their Saviour. The announcement of His coming drew a motley multitude of Jews and Gentiles, eager to witness a manifestation of His power, desirous of obtaining the healing of various infirmities for themselves or their friends.

Thus, they brought to Him one deaf and dumb and besought Him to lay His hand upon him. When the man was healed, they were astounded beyond all measure and said: "He hath done all things well; the deaf He maketh to hear and the dumb to speak."

THE STORY OF THE MIRACLE

Meanwhile the crowd had grown into thousands. They followed Jesus into the wilderness during three days. By that time

their provisions had been exhausted, and now the multitude began to feel the pangs of hunger. Our Saviour's action shows the sympathy He felt for His followers. Calling together His disciples, He declares: "I have compassion on the multitude, for behold they have now been with Me three days and have nothing to eat, and if I shall send them away fasting to their home, they will faint in the way; for some of them came from afar off" (and thus have a long way to go on their return home).

Well, indeed, did the disciples recall the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes which the Master had performed a few months previous. Convinced as they were that Christ could duplicate that miracle at this time, they nevertheless dared not directly ask for a prodigy, all the more so because here the Master was surrounded by pagans, and, as He had said, "it is not fitting to cast the children's bread to dogs." The disciples thus answered Christ: "From whence can any one fill them here with bread in the wilderness?" "How many loaves have you?" asked Jesus. Who said: "Seven, and a few small fishes."

At this point Christ bade the crowd sit down upon the ground. And, taking the seven loaves, He gave thanks looking up to Heaven, to signify thereby that as man He had received from God the power to do what He was about to do. He pronounced the blessing upon the loaves, broke them, and gave them to His disciples to set before the people. In like manner He blessed the few little fishes they had and commanded them to be set before them. In the hands of the Lord the broken bread and the portions of fish multiplied without ceasing, and so He continued to give until all were satisfied. And they did eat and were filled, and they that had eaten were about four thousand.

WHY CHRIST PERFORMED THE MIRACLE

Why did Christ thus feed His followers miraculously? Out of sheer kindheartedness, because, as He said, He had compassion on the multitude. He wished to show that He is the true Son of the Heavenly Father, who clothes the lily of the field and feeds the birds of the air. He desired to remind His disciples that to those who seek first the kingdom of God and His justice all these things shall be added.

The miracle of the loaves and fishes reminds us of that vastly more stupendous multiplication by which our Almighty Father has fed and is feeding millions and billions of His hungry children. It should make us realize and appreciate that it was God who in the beginning created the self-perpetuating seed, that it was God who granted inexhaustible fertility to water and soil, that it is God who causes His sun to rise and His rain to fall upon the just and the unjust. Do we thank God for His benefits? Do we give proof of our gratitude in any tangible way, for example, by saying grace before and after meals?

Christ miraculously fed the hungry multitude to teach His disciples the sweet practice of charity by a shining example. Christ performed this miracle in the midst of pagans to prepare them for the reception of the Gospel later, at the preaching of the Apostles. By the performance of this undeniable visible prodigy Christ, above all perhaps, sought to prepare the minds of men of all times and climes for the reception of the invisible yet more amazing prodigy of the multiplication of the Eucharistic Bread. This astounding multiplication, effected through the ministry of His priests at the Consecration of the Mass, takes place not merely once or twice, not only in one or two localities, but is repeated daily throughout the world from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, and will thus continue to be repeated until the consummation of the world.

The bread that Christ gave His followers strengthened them and enabled them to return to their far-off homes without fainting on the way. The Eucharistic Bread, if received frequently and devoutly, will fill our souls with supernatural strength and enable us to resist successfully the enemies of our salvation, the devil, the world, and the flesh, and without fainting on the way reach our distant Heavenly Home, which is the blessing that I wish you all today.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

False Prophets

By BONAVENTURE MCINTYRE, O.F.M.

*"Beware of false prophets" (Matt., vii. 1).*SYNOPSIS: *I. Our Saviour's Warning Against False Prophets.**II. The Preacher of Heresy.**III. The Agnostic.**IV. The Exponent of the "New Freedom."**V. The Seat of Truth.*

"Beware of false prophets," is the warning cry of Our Saviour in today's Gospel. And today as in the days of old is true what the Evangelist said of Him: "Never did man speak like this Man." Perhaps never before in the history of the world was there such urgent need of heeding Our Saviour's warning that we beware of false prophets. In our day their name is legion.

There is one type of false prophet who, strange to say, is least of all to be feared, although he is the religious type of prophet. Upon Catholics he makes no impression at all. This prophet may sincerely believe that he is preaching Jesus Christ. We respect him for his sincerity, and we believe that he will have the reward of his faith and good works. But this man cannot be right. No man can pit his puny human intelligence against that Church which has its light from heaven.

Enemies of the Church may describe our attitude as one of bigoted self-complacency, but at least let them admit the truth of the indisputable, historical fact that neither human craft nor diabolical power has ever prevailed against her. Kings and emperors and furious antagonists in high places from the days of Nero of Rome have dashed themselves against this Rock, and from the ruins of her enemies the Church has emerged victorious. Her history is the miracle of the ages, the radiance of her chariot wheels flashing upon every generation. And although every worldly glory that saw her birth in Jerusalem in the year 33 is buried in oblivion, she goes marching on. One generation sees her glory blazing to the sky; the next may see her bleeding and drooping and almost dying in the red storm of persecution. Yet, all men know that her existence is more than charmed, for it is deathless, nay divine, even as that of the good Master's who built His church upon the rock

of Peter. She has seen the rise and fall of dynasties, the burial of heresies and heretics, the graves of false philosophies and philosophers, until even those outside her pale are forced by the very tyranny of logic to make the admission that she will exist in undiminished power and grandeur until the last hour of the world rings from the clock of time. As in times past, we may expect that other heresiarchs like Martin Luther will arise to preach another gospel than hers—such gospels as the Apostle called anathema. And other faddists like Mrs. Eddy will appear to fascinate popular fancy for a little day, but they are bound to vanish each in turn while the Church of Christ remains in spite of all the Lilliputian efforts of men. Fire and sword, blood and death, will be her portion as God permits, and her every step down the lane of time may be cemented by the blood of her martyrs. But all these things do not signify one feather's weight in the balance against the promise of her Founder that He would be with her until the consummation of the world.

THE AGNOSTIC

Another type of false prophet is not the religious type by any means. He is rather the man who boasts of being so very broad-minded, the man who sneers at the petty principles of all religions. He may be modern and well read. At least, he has all the popular fallacies at his finger tips. And although he professes no particular creed, he is the first to start religious controversy. Why? The heart very often has reasons of which the mind knows little. Whether a man admits it or not, since the Saviour died on Calvary for our salvation the soul of every man is naturally Christian. "See," such a one will argue, "the clashing doctrines and the warring creeds preached by denominations that are mutually destructive, all of them claiming to be the divinely appointed and exclusive oracles of God's message to men. Can a man find the voice of God in this din of chaotic confusion?" Yes, he can find it; for the True Church founded by Christ certainly exists somewhere today, for He promised that it would last throughout all time and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. As the blessed Saviour stood by His happy little silver lake or walked the dusty streets of Jerusalem, the canvas of the future was ever unrolled before His vision. Surely He would never leave men of good will to grope

blindly. He would set up finger posts pointing the way. The chief of these are the Infallibility and the Supremacy of His Vicar, for the Papacy is not merely a form of ecclesiastical polity or expediency, but a divinely appointed institution to safeguard the True Church from error and disruption. This divine organism has a body with its marks; the divine organism has a head; that head is the rock from which the body shall receive firmness. The head is not a sinless angel but a man stripped of all superhuman advantages, thus showing all the more forcibly the lavishness of God's protective care and showing most conclusively that Christ our Lord is faithful to His promises.

THE EXPONENTS OF THE "NEW FREEDOM"

There is another type of false prophet who seems to be the very special product of the age in which we live. "Free souls" are largely responsible for the new morality—save the word!—which finds its philosophy mainly in the new psychology, its literature in the everlasting sex novel, its art on the stage of which His Eminence Cardinal Hayes did not hesitate to say in a recent pronouncement: "It is reeking with filth." Purity has become the target of the humorist and the dramatist. Onan and Malthus have become household gods, and all the perfumes of Araby cannot down the stench that comes from our divorce courts and commercialized crime.

If men in high places insist on preaching irreligion, is it any wonder that unthinking thousands, who follow their tutelage, are headed back for the luxury and license of pagan days? Educators lower down in the scale imitate these grand seigniors of intellectualism, and, taking refuge behind a screen of learned terminology, talk glibly about self-expression, birth control, realism in art and literature—glittering expressions which gild and veneer the vices, but which ill conceal the grinning pagan gods back of them. A situation matching De Musset's description of conditions in France years ago is passing over our civilization—an era when grown men doubted all, when boys of fifteen left school ruddy with color and fresh with blasphemy.

The modern world has grown sick of the restraints of God, and one does not have to seek far to see the disastrous results of all this. The increase of ghastly, wholesale crimes is painfully illus-

trated in our newspapers, but supplies no more than the basis for a national shudder or two. People talk about national scandals with about the same degree of emphasis as they do when talking about the weather. Society seems to be affected with a kind of moral gangrene.

THE SEAT OF TRUTH

In this appalling situation our Catholic people must be warned. They must not be deceived by the false prophet who leers at them through movie and magazine and newspaper. From altar and pulpit and confessional the wolf must be stripped of the sheep's clothing, for this pagan thing has dared to clothe itself in the very garments of Christianity. Some of our people would compromise because of a wish to appear intellectual and broadminded. Others insist on the necessity of being realists, but, as a learned priest recently observed, there can be no genuine realism in these sacred matters; and the man who insists on being a realist may recoil with horror from grim realism when it slithers across his own doorstep. Priests who listen to the grim tragedy of hurt souls, stripped of all pretense, know that most of this talk about artistic improvement and zeal for realism is plain dishonesty and self-indulgence.

For about two thousand years there has been a great and a very visible institution in this world. She was founded to be the mouth-piece of Him who is called "the Light of the World." This unique institution is the Catholic Church. As she inculcated His truth and guarded His principles through all these centuries, millions have loved her, but a great many have hated her because she has fought against egoism, self-will and passion unrestrained. She has fought kings and statesmen, scientists and *littérateurs*, preachers and reformers, money and money-makers. She has fought them to save them, while they would kill her for doing it. Many will never understand until they wake from the swoon of death. It is hard to understand a kindness that sounds like a rebuke, but the Church has no remedies to offer sick humanity except those prescribed by her Master. Surely there was nothing in His life to indicate that this world was meant to be a march upon roses to Paradise. Hear His words: "He that is not with Me is against Me. Take up thy Cross and follow Me. Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God." People may call it effrontery or by an epithet of hate,

but the world must listen to the word of true prophecy when the Church tells it that there is no happiness for the nations but in following His teachings, no salvation but through His holy Cross.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Right Use of Riches

By BEDE HESS, O.M.C.

"Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity, that when you shall fail, they may receive you into everlasting dwellings" (Luke, xvi. 9).

SYNOPSIS: Today's Gospel message is a part of Christ's social gospel—a parable with a supernatural lesson.

- I. The parable explained in detail: the steward is commended for his shrewdness, cleverness, wisdom.*
- II. First Lesson: "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." Cultivate spiritual shrewdness, supernatural wisdom, other-world cleverness.*
- III. Second Lesson: "Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity, that when you shall fail, they may receive you into everlasting dwellings." The right use of riches explained.*
- IV. The Christian doctrine on the right use of money confirmed by the sentence of the Just Judge on judgment day.*

Today's Gospel message comprises a part of the social gospel of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is couched in the form of a parable—a word picture with a lesson of supernatural value. This parable needs explanation in order to be understood rightly.

Hence, the first part of today's sermon necessarily is an explanation of the parable concerning a certain rich man and his steward, who "was accused unto him that he wasted his goods." The rich man demanded an accounting: "Give an account of thy stewardship, for now thou canst be steward no longer." The steward, embarrassed, said within himself: "What shall I do, because my lord (that is, the rich man) taketh away from me the stewardship? To dig I am not able; to beg I am ashamed. I know what I will do, that when I shall be removed from the stewardship they may receive me into their houses."

And then the steward developed his scheme and executed it. He called "every one of his lord's debtors," and gave each one a discount on his debt: he played his "racket" in order to gain the good will of the debtors. Our Divine Saviour singles out two for

example. To the first the steward said: "How much dost thou owe my lord?" The debtor answered: "A hundred barrels of oil." The steward replied: "Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty." The second was asked: "And how much dost thou owe?" And he answered: "A hundred quarters of wheat." The steward said: "Take thy bill, and write eighty." And so he dealt with "every one of his lord's debtors."

These debtors had leased the land of the rich man. They were to pay their rental in oil—olive oil—and in wheat, the products of the soil in Palestine. The steward was the rich man's superintendent. It was his duty to collect the revenue and to check up on the rich man's debtors. When he received notice of his impending dismissal, he turned "racketeer," changing the bill of every one of the rich man's debtors. He made friends, of course, who would do him a good turn when he needed them. The lord, that is the land-owner, when he heard of the "racket" of his steward, "commended the unjust steward, forasmuch as he had done *wisely*." He called him shrewd, clever, slick—a wise fellow. He did not praise his injustice, but he did admire his shrewdness.

THE FIRST LESSON OF THE PARABLE

Then Our Lord and Saviour draws his lessons for supernatural life from the parable. The first lesson is: "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." It is true that the children of this world are wiser in furthering their earthly affairs and shrewder in promoting their material interests and more clever in making financial profit—in their investments and enterprises—than the children of light are in furthering their spiritual affairs and in promoting their eternal interests and in gaining merit for the world to come. Worldlings are wiser and more clever in seeking temporal things than the children of light are in seeking eternal values. This is the first lesson.

THE SECOND LESSON

The second—and the one which will hold our attention—is worded by Our Saviour as follows: "And I say to you: 'Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity, that when you shall fail, they may receive you into everlasting dwellings.'" This is the

real lesson of the parable: it is the lesson of spiritual shrewdness, supernatural wisdom, other-world cleverness. It is the rich man's readiest means of salvation.

Christ Jesus on another occasion spoke the threatening words: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! For it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Luke, xviii. 24-25). Place these words of Our Saviour side by side, and you have learned the dangers—the spiritual dangers—of riches, but also the saving power of riches when used wisely.

THE RIGHT USE OF RICHES

The second part of this sermon is, thus, on the *right use of riches*. Money, wealth, riches, possessions, and the lack of them play such an important part in our economic life that both the rich and the poor must have the right understanding, the Christian viewpoint, on the matter of earthly goods. Our Saviour's parable lesson will be understood and appreciated much better and put into practice more faithfully by those who know their Christian doctrine on the right use of riches. Our Christian doctrine on the right use of riches may be summarized in the following statements.

First, "God has not created us for the perishable and transitory things of earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting. He has given us this world as a place of exile, and not as our abiding place. As for riches and the other things which men call good and desirable, whether we have them in abundance or lack them altogether—so far as eternal happiness is concerned, it matters little. The only important thing is to use them aright" (Leo XIII, "Rerum Novarum"). These are the words of Pope Leo XIII. If we are permitted to paraphrase them, they mean the following: "Money, wealth, riches are not the be-all and end-all of life. Man was not made for them; they were made for man that he may procure the necessities and comforts and some of the luxuries of life, and that they may aid him to work out his salvation."

Secondly, money, wealth, riches are not an unconditional blessing. On the contrary, "those whom fortune favors are warned that freedom from sorrow and abundance of earthly riches are no warrant for the bliss that shall never end, but rather obstacles;

that the rich should tremble at the threatenings of Jesus Christ—threatenings so unwonted in the mouth of Our Lord—and that a most strict account must be given to the Supreme Judge for all we possess” (Leo XIII, “*Rerum Novarum*”). Let us remember that honest poverty is no shame and honest wealth is no sin, but that dishonest poverty is a disgrace and dishonest wealth is a crime.

RULE FOR THE RIGHT USE OF MONEY

Consequently, the chief and most excellent rule for the right use of money is this: “Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without hesitation when others are in need. . . . When what necessity demands has been supplied, and one’s standing fairly taken thought for, it becomes a duty to give to the indigent out of what remains over. . . . It is a duty, not of justice save in extreme cases, but of Christian charity” (Leo XIII, “*Rerum Novarum*”). This means that no man is the absolute—that is, the unconditional—owner of his wealth, but merely its administrator. His wealth belongs to God; and he, God’s steward, must use it according to the intentions of the Master who entrusted it to him. He has no right to spend it as he wills, and employ it solely for his own advantage. He may keep what he and his family require for a livelihood, for their condition in life, for a necessary estate and inheritance according to this condition, but all the rest he must give to the poor. Earthly goods were created to supply the needs of all. Though they can be privately appropriated, they still preserve their common purpose according to the order established by God. Those who, to a large extent, monopolize them for their own exclusive use, divert them from their providential purpose. Few have there been in all ages who have understood this, and who have taken note of the grave responsibilities imposed upon them by wealth.

THE OBLIGATION OF ALMSGIVING

The obligation of almsgiving—of doing good with one’s money—binds under sin, yea, under the pain of mortal sin. This is taught in Catholic Moral Theology (cfr. Noldin, II, 90), and is based on the following words of Scripture: “I command thee to open thy hand to thy needy and poor brother, that liveth with thee in the

land." (Deut., xv. 11). And upon these: "He that hath the substance of this world, and shall see his brother in need, and shall shut up his bowels from him, how doth the charity of God abide in him?" (I John, iii. 17). And again upon the sentence of condemnation upon those who neglect almsgiving, doing good with their money. "Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand: 'Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry, and you gave Me not to eat; I was thirsty, and you gave Me not to drink; I was a stranger, and you took Me not in; naked, and you covered Me not; sick, and in prison, and you did not visit Me. . . . Amen I say to you, as long as you did it not to one of these least, neither did you do it to Me'" (Matt., xxv. 41-45).

WAYS OF DOING CHARITY

Finally, the ways and means of doing charity are suggested by the corporal works of mercy, which are: to feed the hungry, to give drink to the thirsty, to clothe the naked, to harbor the harborless, to visit the sick and imprisoned, and to bury the dead. And be it emphasized that organized charity does not suspend the obligation of personal charity. The obligation of doing charity with one's money is a personal obligation, and all the organized charity in the world cannot suspend this personal obligation. The amount of charity to be done is determined by this rule: each one must do charity out of his superfluity, that is, out of what remains over after the necessities, comforts of life and an inheritance according to one's station have been provided for oneself and family.

Now let us repeat Our Saviour's parable lesson. He says: "Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity." That is: "Use your money—your superfluous money, that which remains over after you have provided the necessities and comforts of life and an inheritance for yourself and your family—in doing charity, and make friends of the poor, the orphans, the widows, the aged, the distressed, the sick, the suffering, briefly, of life's unfortunates; *that when you shall fail* (that is, when your money has no more value, when your last day comes) *they may receive you into everlasting dwellings*—that is, so that the friends you have made through your charity,

your almsdeeds, and your good works may guarantee your salvation."

Will this happen? Is this the spiritual shrewdness, the supernatural wisdom, the other-world cleverness, that Our Saviour demands from the children of light? Indeed, it is. Listen to Him, as he describes the last accounting. He spoke these words:

"When the Son of man shall come in His majesty, and all the Angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the seat of His majesty, and all the nations shall be gathered together before Him. And He shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats, and He shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on His left.

"Then shall the King say to them that shall be on His right hand: 'Come ye blessed of My Father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry, and you gave Me to eat; I was thirsty, and you gave Me to drink; I was a stranger, and you took Me in; naked, and you covered Me; sick, and you visited Me; I was in prison, and you came to Me.'

"Then shall the just answer Him saying: 'Lord, when did we see Thee hungry, and feed Thee; thirsty, and gave Thee drink? And when did we see Thee a stranger, and took Thee in; or naked, and covered Thee? Or when did we see Thee sick or in prison, and came to Thee?'

"And the King answering shall say to them: 'Amen I say to you, as long as you did it to one of these My least brethren, you did it to Me.' "

Indeed, "make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity, that when you shall fail, they may receive you into everlasting dwellings."

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Contentment With God's Providence

By ALBERT WOOD, D.D.

"All these things happened to them in figure: and they are written for our correction" (I Cor., x. 11).

- SYNOPSIS: I. St. Paul's references to Old Testament history.
II. The evil of discontent.
III. God's antidote.
IV. Conclusions.

Today's extract from St. Paul's Epistle gives in a summary form the history of God's dealings with His chosen people during the time between their liberation from Egypt and their rest in the promised land of Canaan. Each statement of St. Paul's should be read in conjunction with a passage from the Old Testament.

"Let us not covet evil things, as they also coveted." This may be taken with the eleventh chapter of the Book of Numbers, wherein we read how the people complained against the food provided by God in the form of manna, and demanded flesh meat. An abundance of quails was sent them, but their greed exhibited in collecting and devouring them provoked the wrath of God, and He "struck them with an exceeding great plague."

"Neither become ye idolators, as some of them, as it is written: 'The people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play.' " This relates to the thirty-second chapter of the Book of Exodus, wherein is described how, while Moses had ascended Mount Sinai, the people prevailed upon Aaron to make them a golden calf to which they offered holocausts and peace victims.

"Neither let us commit fornication; as some of them committed fornication, and there fell in one day three and twenty thousand." The reference here is to the twenty-fifth chapter of the Book of Numbers, which tells how Balaam, having failed in his efforts, instigated by the King of Moab, to curse the Jewish people, gave the king counsel that he should send amongst them the seductive women of Moab. Thus, many Jews fell into sins of the flesh and of idolatry, and "Moses said to the judges of Israel: 'Let every man kill his neighbors that have been initiated to Beelphegor.' . . . And there were slain four and twenty thousand men" (Num., xxv. 5-9).

"Neither let us tempt Christ: as some of them tempted, and perished by the serpents." The twenty-first chapter of the Book of Numbers tells how "the people began to be weary of their journey and labor: and speaking against God and Moses, they said: 'Why didst thou bring us out of Egypt to die in the wilderness? There is no bread, nor have we any waters: our soul now loatheth this very light food.' Wherefore the Lord sent among the people fiery serpents, which bit them and killed many of them" (Num., xxi. 4-6).

"Neither do you murmur: as some of them murmured, and were

destroyed by the destroyer." The murmurs here referred to are the complaints against the leadership of Moses and Aaron in consequence of which the people were divided into two camps and a section of the rebels with its leaders, Core, Dathan and Abiron, were swallowed alive into the earth, while others to the number of 250 were consumed by fire. The sedition recurring, the fire reappeared and destroyed still more to the number of 14,700 (Num., xvi. 1-50).

These events are not given by St. Paul in their accepted order of time. Historically, the idolatry at Sinai is first, then the lust for quails, then the rebellion of Core, then the complaints punished by serpents, and finally the seductions of the Moabite women. The time covered by these events is less than forty years.

THE EVIL OF DISCONTENT

Perhaps no period of history can furnish a more striking example of repeated discontent with God's Providence. Yet, St. Paul warns us that these things happened to them in figure, and are written for our correction. The evil of dissatisfaction and discontent with God is not indeed confined to Jewish history. No age is lacking in it. The Early Church of the New Testament was affected by it. It is not uncommon in our own days.

That the early Church was affected by it is clear from other portions of this same Epistle. St. Paul scolds the people of Corinth, and reproves them for many defections from the law of Christ. "There are quarrels among you," he says. "Impurity is actually to be heard of among you. . . . Some, still swayed by habits of idol-worship, eat idol-offerings as such, and their conscience, being weak, is defiled" (I Cor., i. 11, v. 1, viii. 7).

That it is not uncommon in our own days need hardly be exemplified. The "Imitation of Christ" reminds us that "many follow Jesus to the breaking of bread, but few to the drinking of the chalice of His Passion. . . . Many love Jesus as long as they meet with no adversity; many praise Him and bless Him as long as they receive consolation from Him. But if Jesus hide Himself and leave them for a little while, they either fall into complaints or excessive dejection" (Book II, Chapter 111.)

The same evil has probably affected each of us in some measure.

How have we received setbacks and trials, which have perhaps come upon us without apparent reason? How have we borne, perhaps, a continual poverty of worldly possessions, or some prolonged affliction of ill-health, or the dramatic suddenness with which loved ones have been sometimes snatched away from us by Providence?

GOD'S ANTIDOTE FOR DISCONTENT

If we look to ourselves and our trials only, we may easily fall a prey to discontent, but if we look outside of ourselves, we can as easily find the moral strength we need. For God has not left us without the necessary antidote for such temptations, and for that purpose He has from time to time raised up notable men and women who by their strength and endurance give witness to what God's grace can do to sweeten the bitterness of life. Thus, even to the Jews was given the example of Moses, of whom Scripture says that he was "a man exceeding meek above all men that dwelt upon earth" (Num., xii. 3). To the early Christians was given the example of their martyrs. Frail girls and women, such as St. Agnes, St. Lucy, St. Catherine, St. Cecilia, and St. Agatha, showed how to lose all things and suffer all things for Christ's sake. Undaunted by torture or the natural horror of approaching death, they were able to answer, rebuke, and dispute with their judges and persecutors. Some could even sport with death as St. Lawrence, who knowing full well the awful anger and revenge he would incur, yet when asked by the Prefect of Rome to show where was the treasure of the Church, mocked him by showing him an assembly of the poor and the lame. In the midst of torments, too, he could still jest with torturers: "Let my body be turned," he said, "one side is broiled enough." And a little later: "It is dressed enough, you may eat." Then praying for his persecutors he expired.

Nor was a similar strength wanting in the martyrs of England at the Reformation. When Blessed Sir Thomas More was warned by the Duke of Norfolk that his life was endangered, he merely replied: "Is that all, My Lord. Then the only difference between Your Grace and me is that I shall die today and you tomorrow." So too, when Blessed John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, was led out to death, he observed the sun high in the heavens and remarked

from the scaffold: "I shall soon be above yon fellow." What must have been the sentiments of the spectators who saw such men and women surrender much that this world could give, and go to meet death contented and happy. Predominant in all sympathetic hearts must have been a deep sense of the Majesty of God and a willing acceptance of the rulings of His Providence. The recollection of those events should fill us with a similar contentment.

Other examples of a more simple kind are furnished by God in the persons of the sick. Who can watch a fellow-creature bearing the slow wasting of disease, and not be moved by the patience therein exhibited? Let any malcontent or grumbler walk the wards of a great hospital, or visit anywhere—as at Lourdes—a large number of the bedridden and afflicted, and ponder upon the patience with which Christian Faith can inspire them. Such sights should stop complaints and discontent, and should stir anyone to desire a large measure of that same spirit of contentment.

THE TRUE SOURCE OF CONTENTMENT

For such perfection mere human nature is not sufficient. Contentment must be founded in the love of God, must be sustained by His grace, and must find expression in the attitude of mind indicated by St. Paul when he wrote: "We have not here a lasting city, but we seek one that is to come. . . . Let us run by patience to the fight proposed to us: looking on Jesus, the author and finisher of faith, who, having joy set before Him, endured the cross" (Heb., xiii. 14, xii. 1-2).

In that lies the secret of the strength of the Saints. We might almost fancy, as we read their Lives, that they lived in another world. Yet, it was not another world, nor were their experiences very different from our own. Their motive and outlook were different, and that difference led them to the otherwise unattainable heights. We must try to acquire their view of life, their happiness in the love of God, and their contentment with His Providence.

When tempted to "covet evil things," we must stand firm, not "thinking ourselves to stand," but standing firm in God and in our confidence and hope in Him, and saying to Satan: "The Lord is my light and my salvation, whom shall I fear? The Lord is the protector of my life: of whom shall I be afraid?" (Psalm xxvi. 1-2).

Book Reviews

CHRIST OUR BROTHER

This is a remarkable book.¹ It is needed. School, college and now radio are giving us the dry bones of Apologetics; authors rattle them in many volumes. Karl Adam's book clothes them with flesh and blood and makes them live. He brings Our Saviour into our innermost lives; he shows us, as the title indicates, that Christ is "our brother." In doing so, he has attempted a difficult problem. To separate, as it were, in his treatment the two natures of Christ and especially to offer lay people Christ the Man almost (as the superficial reader might infer) to the exclusion of the divine nature, is a risky proposition. Even at times such a trained theologian as is Dr. Adam seems to lose his perspective. In comparing the joy and optimism of Christ's teaching with the austere preaching of John the Baptist, to the seeming disparagement of the latter, one might forget the Precursor was sent for that very gloomy object. His task was to convince people of sin and urge penance. Later on in the volume Dr. Adam seems to accept the traditional view of the laity and apparently ignores a distinction which, while often a stumbling block to the lay mind, is accepted by it as an unquestioned reality.

Dr. Adam is more than a trained theologian. He has an intimate knowledge of the capacity and limitations of the lay mind. He knows how to place before it abstruse theological truths in plain and understandable, even eloquent, language. While the book is not easy reading, it is not too difficult for persons of average education. Not a popular treatise for moving-picture minds, it demands and will repay slow and thoughtful perusal. For seminarians it fills the traditional long-felt gap and will give a better understanding of their dogmatic tracts on the subject. It should not serve as a sermon source book for priests, but one to be meditated on by them to fill their minds with the true concept of the Mediator before they expound His teaching.

This teaching and the personality of Christ are brought out by a skillful coördination of the words of Our Saviour in an harmonious whole. His sayings, directions and example scattered throughout the Gospels are united in what the worldly moderns would call a character sketch. These texts of Scripture take on, not a new meaning, but a clearer idea of what was hidden to most of us. "We have a brother who is God," is the final exultant exclamation after leading us through pages of intimate contact with Jesus. That contact should mean active participation in the life of Christ.

¹*Christ Our Brother.* By Karl Adam. Translated by Dom Justin McCann, O.S.B. (The Macmillan Company, New York City).

The chapter, "Jesus and Prayer," is convincing and practical. That entitled "Through Christ Our Lord" has much food for the clergy as well as for the laity. Pointing out our neglect of God the Father and of the Holy Ghost and of prayer to Them "through the Son," and the overemphasis of the divinity of Christ by making Him an unapproachable God, Dr. Adam shows the result is a religion of fear and leads directly to an exaggerated veneration of the Saints. While this reference, perhaps, has more to do with the Eastern Church, it is applicable to a growing abuse in this country, where commercialism in the devotion to certain Saints tends to obliterate Christ entirely. To those who have succumbed to this temptation, we recommend pages 53 and following for examination of conscience. In fact, a thorough study of this book will persuade them they are robbing the people of their faith. So convinced is the author of the principle developed in this chapter, "Through Christ Our Lord," that he seems almost to apologize when Our Saviour speaks once of prayer to Himself, and for the prayers after the *Agnus Dei* in the Mass.

The temptation to quote the author is strong; to yield to it would be to reprint many pages. We will call attention to this strong feature: he proves the necessity of the realization of the bond of charity which should unite all in Christ, the Mediator and High Priest. His exposition of St. Paul's famous chapter is not only eloquent but emphatically compelling. He makes the Gospels live, not modernizing them or bothering about recent aberrations, but making them the practical guide of our modern life. Legalism goes into the background to make way for the love of God. Individual piety, as such, gets scant praise from him. "The Christian never toils and suffers and dies *alone*, that word is absent from his vocabulary. 'The passion of Christ,' says St. Thomas, 'belongs to us as really as though we ourselves had suffered it.'"

It is a joyous book. In it there is not a note of sadness. It is practical. It is one of the best published in years. It is impossible to recommend it too highly. The translator has done a good work; his rendering reads like an original. The publishers have done their share well and deserve thanks for making a reasonable price.

JOHN L. BELFORD, D.D.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND DEFENSE

The three publications which are brought to the notice of the readers under the above heading combine in a happy manner the expository and the apologetical method.¹ Although they will be read with great

¹ *Catholicism: A Religion of Common Sense*. By P. J. Gearon, O.C.C., D.D. (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

profit by Catholics who wish to gain a fuller insight into their Faith, they are primarily intended for non-Catholics seeking acquaintance with Catholic doctrine and practice. In the instruction of converts they ought to prove very helpful. To the clergy they may be recommended as containing much potential sermon material.

The book of Father Gearon is the very thing one would want to put into the hands of an honest inquirer after the true religion.¹ It will open his eyes to the many claims which Catholicism has on our assent. Written in a simple and unpretentious style, it proves that the Catholic religion is in fullest accord with all the requirements of reason, and that it meets the aspirations of the human heart in a way that eloquently proclaims its superhuman origin. It is evident that the splendid little volume has grown out of long experience in missionary work, and that it offers what is especially needed in dealing with those not of the Fold. The difficulties it smooths away are not of the abstract type but rather such as will crop out in actual life. The irenic tone that pervades the pages of the book from cover to cover cannot fail in making many friends.

Upon This Rock is a much more ambitious volume.² Its diction not only occasionally rises to the heights of eloquence, but habitually moves on a lofty level of expression. The author's aim is to demonstrate that among all rival churches the Catholic Church is the only one that can substantiate her claim to divine origin. In her he finds clearly discernible the lineaments which are predicated of the Church of Christ in the Books of the New Testament. Father Mueller makes the argument strong and impressive, and builds it up on an impregnable basis. The portions of the volume which show that the Church in the course of history has always been on the side of true humanism and promoted civilization in every respect, are particularly timely in our days when so many doctrines are put forth that are destructive of all the finer values of life. Since the case of the Church, as the eloquent writer presents it, is so strong, it can easily dispense with the rhetorical exaggerations which mar, for example, page 186.

Father Scott deals with very timely topics.³ He plunges right into the thick of the battle when he wrestles with such much-discussed problems as sex, modern morality, marriage, divorce, birth control, Christ True God, and Christ's Church. On all these important subjects erroneous notions are being disseminated throughout the country, and it is imperatively necessary that these false teachings be counteracted. The author does the task well. In lucid and forceful language he brings home the conviction that Catholic teaching concerning these

¹ *Upon This Rock*. By Rev. F. J. Mueller. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York City).

² *Marriage*. By Martin J. Scott, S.J. (The Paulist Press, New York City).

matters is not only in harmony with the Scriptures but also serves the best interests of mankind. Attractive in its general get-up and inexpensive, the volume lends itself to the widest circulation.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

ROADS TO ROME

The Roads to Rome are many. Dom Verkade, O.S.B., strews flowers along the way—rosemary and pansies exquisitely intertwined: "There's rosemary—that's for remembrance . . . and there's pansies, that's for thoughts." Remembrances and thoughts thereupon make up the burden of the Artist-Monk's book.¹ Born in Holland of Protestant parents, his talent for painting led him in 1891 to Paris, where a group of his artist friends made him a disciple of Theosophy. He went to Brittany and, curiously enough, allowed one of his friends to persuade him to leave the village of Saint Nolff merely because a "mission" was to be given in the church: "One day Ballin brought me a 'fearful piece of news': 'In two weeks,' he said, 'the Jesuits are coming here to hold a mission.' That was too much even for me. 'My Lord,' I exclaimed, 'when those celestial dragons come, we will get out, and come back again only when they have gone away.'" The anecdote illustrates the lively character of the narrative. He tells entrancingly the tale of how he came to be baptized, how he won his Jewish friend, Ballin, to Catholicism, how both went to Italy, how he spent some time in a Franciscan convent and there learned of Beuron and its artistic school, and how finally he became a monk there. There is no "arguing" in the narrative. Its implications alone make excellent apologetics. Congratulations are due to the translator for his excellent rendering.

An apologetic of different kind is given by Father Scott,² whose powers of clear exposition make his analysis of the Apostles' Creed interesting to a serious-minded reader. Priests and prospective converts will rejoice in this latest addition to the fast-growing library of Father Scott's apologetics.

Something in the story line comes to us in Father Martindale's skilfully wrought bits of correspondence between the unlettered Bill Brock and Father X and a few other characters, leading ultimately to Bill's conversion.³ Father Martindale protests, nevertheless, that he did not intend to make a "Catechism-in-fiction" or an "instruction book," but thinks it may have value for "breaking the ice or providing a few hints or preliminary notions about our Faith."

¹ *Yesterdays of an Artist-Monk*. By Dom Willibrord Verkade, O.S.B. Translated from the original German by John L. Stoddard (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York City).

² *Christ's Own Church*. By Martin J. Scott, S.J. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York City).

³ "Bill." By C. C. Martindale, S. J. (Benziger Brothers, New York City).

Father Gillis puts into a beautifully printed volume⁴ his discourses delivered in the Catholic Hour under the auspices of the National Council of Catholic Men. They had been already published in pamphlet form, but without the Questions and Answers included in the present volume. Needless to say that the discourses are admirable alike in style and in content.

Father Houck warns his readers that while his book⁵ "has not been written or compiled in order to prove the existence of an all-good God, still even the religiously indifferent, I trust, will be prompted by its perusal to give thanks for the divine favors here described. These will then become to him 'fountains of joy.'" It is therefore, in a wide sense, apologetic, and ought to lead to Rome. The *leit-motif* of the title is heard throughout in the First Part—Water (all kinds—clouds, rain, dew, hoar frost, snow, ice; in brook, creek, cataract, waterfall, river, ocean—treated scientifically and poetically); in the Second Part—Sacramental Water (water as a symbol of religious truths, in the baptismal font, in Holy Water, etc.); in the Third Part—The Precious Blood and the Sacraments (the Sacramental system, the Mass, Baptism, etc.). An interesting recital that may lead the indifferent reader to fine conclusions in respect of his devoirs to God.

In a similarly indirect fashion, volumes of verse inspired throughout by Catholic faith may be, in a large sense, apologetic without any appearance of over-religiousness. We have now what has been called a definitive edition⁶ of the poems of Thomas Walsh. Michael Williams phrases my thought: "Thomas Walsh appears to me a figure of lasting importance. He represented Catholic civilization." Catholic thought also permeates the volume⁷ of Father Dunne's poems. They are largely religious in sentiment even when greatly personal in nature.

H. T. HENRY, Litt.D.

⁴ *The Ten Commandments*. By Rev. James M. Gillis, of the Paulist Fathers. (The Paulist Press, New York City).

⁵ *Fountains of Joy; or "By Water and Blood."* By the Rev. Frederick A. Houck (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

⁶ *Selected Poems of Thomas Walsh*. With a Memoir by John Bunker and appreciations by Edward L. Keyes and Michael Williams (Lincoln Mac Veagh, The Dial Press, New York City).

⁷ *Diwan*. By Rev. Gerald W. E. Dunne, Litt.D. (Toledo Artcraft Company, Toledo, O.).

FOR THE PAMPHLET RACK

As people grow older they ordinarily acquire a more extensive and intensive knowledge of this world. Yet, sad to say, many Catholics also go through life with little more than the half-remembered religious knowledge acquired long ago in childhood. Superimposed upon this background is the stray religious reading that they may do and the

occasional brief Sunday instruction. With this humanly inadequate equipment they must meet and override the sophisms that invest them daily. Such a condition surely seems to be one prime cause of our admitted and lamentable leakage.

A remedy to hand is the pamphlet and its rack. There are splendid pamphlets covering the whole range of Catholic life, the faith and its practice. But if they are not made available to the people and drawn to their attention by occasional pulpit reference, and finally if they are not read, their production is so much lost motion. But people do read these pamphlets when they can secure them, are eager to read them, and indeed many pamphlets are helpful to the priest himself. All of which would seem to indicate clerical opportunity and responsibility in the matter.

Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana, is the authorized publisher of the radio addresses delivered on the Catholic Hour. These have put Christ and His Church before the nation in splendid fashion. As these addresses are the product of representative minds, they have more than ephemeral worth, and are more than welcome in this permanent form as highly valuable contributions to our apologetic literature. Those published thus far are:

The Divine Romance, Seven Lectures delivered by the Rev. Dr. Fulton J. Sheen (80 pp., 20 cents; \$9 per hundred);

The Moral Order, and *Mary the Mother of Jesus*, Six Addresses by the Rev. George Johnson (64 pp., 15 cents; \$6.00 per hundred);

A Trilogy on Prayer, Three Addresses by the Rev. Thomas F. Burke, C.S.P. (32 pp., 10 cents; \$5.00 per hundred);

The Story of the Bible, Five Addresses by the Rev. Dr. Francis L. Keenan (64 pp., 15 cents; \$6.00 per hundred);

Four Religious Founders, a Collection of Addresses by Rev. Dr. Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., Rev. Benedict Bradley, O.S.B., Rev. Thomas M. Schwertner, O.P., Rev. Sigmund Cratz, O.M.Cap., and Rev. M. J. Ahern, S.J. (56 pp., 15 cents; \$6.00 per hundred);

The Philosophy of Catholic Education, Three Addresses by the Rev. Dr. Charles L. O'Donnell (32 pp., 15 cents; \$5.00 per hundred);

Christianity and the Modern Mind, Six Addresses by the Rev. John A. McClorey, S.J. (64 pp., 15 cents; \$6.00 per hundred);

The Moral Law, Eight Addresses by the Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P. (88 pp., 25 cents; \$9.50 per hundred);

Christ and His Church, Eight Addresses by the Rt. Rev. Joseph M. Corrigan, D.D. (88 pp., 25 cents; \$9.50 per hundred).

The same press publishes *The Catholic Press vs. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America* by the Rt. Rev. J. F. Noll, D.D. This presents popularly the Catholic view on birth control as opposed

to that of the latest religious body to be swamped by the rising tide of paganism. (32 pp., 15 cents; 12 for a \$1.00; 100 for \$5.00).

A series of new pamphlets have been also received from the Paulist Press, New York City. *Tell My Fortune*, by Daniel L. Fitzgerald, a Nickel Book, reveals the fact, readily confirmed by casual conversation with educated people outside the Church, of the growth of the religion of superstition among those whose faith has drifted from the moorings of Revelation. The people of the United States pay annually \$125,000,000 dollars to 100,000 charlatans for this "bunk." *Belief in God and in Evolution*, *The Harmony of Religion and Science*, and *Evolution and Religion, Facing Facts*, by Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph.D., give satisfying answer to some questions of the day and might well be in the hands of all high school graduates. *The Three Great Encyclicals* (The Condition of Labor, Christian Education of Youth, Christian Marriage) and *The First Radio Broadcast of His Holiness* offer in one useful pamphlet the saving principles of the Church, the one rock in a sea of change.

How to Serve Low Mass, by Rev. W. A. O'Brien, is an attractive text-book of ceremonies for altar boys. It contains diagrams and an interlinear phonetic arrangement of the server's responses (Benziger Brothers, New York City, eighteen cents a copy, less in quantity).

The Layman in the Parish, a Plea, by Wilfred Woollen, M.A., is a constructive criticism of present parochial administration. It would fix more responsibility on the laity, avoid the spiritual, mental and physical loss engendered among the clergy by money-getting, and thus promote missionary advance. The author claims that it would secure the publicity, strict accounting, and coöperation between clergy and laity, and corporate parish responsibility that obtained in English medievalism. While he says that the laity would not dominate the clergy, it will be examined by American readers with Trusteeism in mind (Sands and Co., London, six pence).

Our Holy Hour, by Rev. J. F. Enright, is a 23-page booklet for priests and people containing reflections, prayers and hymns suitable to the devotion (1040-21 Ave. N., St. Petersburg, Florida, ten cents a copy; \$7.00 per hundred).

JOHN K. SHARP.

A BROKEN CAREER

Hilaire Belloc, that indefatigable digger and delver into the religious débâcle of the sixteenth century in England, follows closely the rules laid down by Cicero for historians: "Never dare to publish what is false, never conceal the truth, avoid all suspicion of favoritism or aversion." Influenced also by De Maistre's famous aphorism that history in recent years has been one vast conspiracy against truth, he

rejects popular tales and worn legends, seeking truth at its fountain-head. No theory is accepted, no statement accepted, unless verified from authentic sources. He may err occasionally by defect, never by excess.

In his latest biography of Cardinal Wolsey,¹ he divests himself of all inherited or acquired national, political or religious prejudice, and relates candidly and frankly the life story of the great English Cardinal and statesman, his virtues and vices, his triumphs and failures. Making no pretense to original discoveries, as few men of that period have been so well written up as Wolsey (especially in Pollard's biography), he confines himself rather to interpretations and conclusions. He avers it was not so much the personal achievements of Wolsey as the place and time of his activity which influenced his career and militated against his success. It was the age of opportunity. The Americas had been discovered, the Indies revealed, the treasures of pagan antiquity poured into the laps of European scholars. His monarch showered him with favors; the Church bestowed its choicest honors. Yet, he fell from defect of intelligence and weakness of will. He had no vision except for the moment. His own glories ended in humiliation and death, and in his fall he pulled down the ancient Church in England.

Ambition was Wolsey's fatal sin. He rose from obscurity to the highest political place in the State, almost overshadowing the king by the brilliancy and daring of his achievements. The Church made him Archbishop, Cardinal, and Legate. In his fondest dreams he saw himself enthroned in the Chair of Peter. Nor were these altogether idle fancies. On two occasions his name received prominent mention in the Papal Consistory. Yet, his political power waned under Anne Boleyn's resentment; his ecclesiastical ambitions ended in ruin, and in his fall he dragged down that Church he had sworn to cherish and defend. "In spite of himself and of his sympathies," says the author, "and as an unintended foreign policy, he made Protestantism in Europe . . . and he dimly perceived in his last agony that not only had he failed, but that the salvation of Europe was failing too."

This tragic failure of the great churchman and statesman may shed new light on one of the most mooted questions of church history, the sudden defection of the Catholic body in England. It has long been a subject of acrid discussion why a nation so Catholic, with a distinguished hierarchy and an apparently blameless clergy, should abandon its birthright in a few short years, rejecting the truths of the ancient Faith and the traditions of centuries, and embracing the fantastic innovations framed by the ministers of Edward VI and perfected by Elizabeth and Cecil. Even such an able advocate as Cardinal Manning constantly asserts that English Catholics were robbed

¹ *Wolsey*. By Hilaire Belloc (J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia and London).

of the Faith. Perhaps the tragic story of Wolsey's private life may explain the weakness of the faith among the lesser clergy and the laity when the crisis came. It may be another clue to the apostasy of a great Catholic nation within a brief period. This is a typical Belloc book, candid, honest, reliable, readable, and a welcome addition to the religious history of England during the sixteenth century.

THOMAS P. PHELAN, LL.D.

AN ARMFUL OF BOOKS

In *Peregrinus Goes Abroad* (Frederick Pusset Co., New York City), the fertile and learned pen of the Reverend Michael Andrew Chapman, the distinguished convert, editor and author, has given us another volume of liturgical lore that deserves a place on the shelves of every priest. The clerical philosophers and humorists—the Liturgiologist and the Antiquary—treat also of ecclesiastical etiquette, and the whole effectively because attractively. The first two parts of the book register by narrative and travelogue many wise observations, some of which will strike many readers as new. The third, in serious didactic style, is equally interesting. One observation—perhaps more interesting because of recent comment—is that a bishop should be called “monsignor” rather than “bishopsed.” The chapter titles are as arresting as their subject-matter is enlightening, and all is presented breezily. The volume is liturgy made readable—nay, as delightful as the most whimsical of essays.

In John Gibbons' most attractive volume, *Tramping to Lourdes* (P. J. Kenedy and Sons), we are privileged to accompany a happy pilgrim who shuns the crowded highways and leads us into the far more interesting by-paths of the countryside where we meet men and women who are native to the soil and who still have the charming ways and the quaint customs of their ancestors. Though not a pilgrim in the strictest sense of the word, the author speaks reverently of everything that pertains to religion and relates many truly edifying experiences. Theological disquisitions are not in the line of the author, who is a journalist by profession, but his shrewd observations inspired by a naturally religious temperament are exceedingly stimulating. An ideal book for leisurely reading.

In *The Gospel of Divine Providence*, from the French of Henri Maurice (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.), Father Lelen has once again translated a highly useful spiritual treatise. The burden of the book is the intimately personal nature of predestination: God's care of each and every creature, the means He uses and the rules he follows, and our duties and feelings towards Him. The exposition presents with French clarity the sweet comfort and divine unction of God's providence. It will be useful for retreat readings. But reader and preacher must make their own index of the gems that are set forth in the striking analogies and illustrations that come as flashes on their inward vision.

The
Homiletic and Pastoral Review

Vol. XXXI

JULY, 1931

No. 10

PASTORALIA

The Pastoral Ministry

Though the entire seminary course is in a measure directed towards practical ends, there is one department which more immediately than the others deals with practical issues and aims to prepare the young priest for the proper and efficient discharge of the various duties of his office. This immediate practical preparation is of vital importance, since without it the young levite, in spite of his intellectual training, would have difficulties in finding his bearings amid his new surroundings, and be sorely bewildered and perplexed by the multiplicity of the duties that confront him. To Pastoral Theology, therefore, on account of its great practical value, a high rank should be assigned in the hierarchy of seminary studies. The young man who enters upon his duties without the practical guidance derived from this branch of theology labors under a severe handicap and deserves our sympathy. He may, it is true, in the course of time overcome this disadvantage, but only after many mistakes and disappointments. Learning by experience is a costly process involving much wastefulness. Some things will always have to be left to experience, because no amount of training can anticipate all possibilities of application, but the number of these things should be reduced to a minimum. This is especially true with regard to such an important business as that of the saving of souls. The less we leave in this matter to happy chance and hit-or-miss methods, the better it is. We do not share the cheap contempt which a certain type of mind affects for applied science. Speculative science may in itself be of a higher order than applied science, but in a world that calls for action the latter cannot be denied a foremost place. Experienced pastors who have eked out their inadequate practical training by their own experiences will

be the first to put a high value on Pastoral Theology. Unhesitatingly they will endorse what Father J. B. Hogan, S.S., writes in its favor: "Such is Pastoral Theology, a compound of intuition, experience, and positive knowledge, inexhaustible as a science, as an art never sufficiently known. It is the crowning, for the pastor of souls, of all other forms of knowledge, the connecting link by which all ecclesiastical science is placed in contact with its ultimate object. True, while never entirely out of sight from the beginning, it should not occupy the foreground in the period of preparation, because studies of a purely practical kind lack depth, and fail to strengthen the mind. But sacred knowledge once mastered, the chief effort must be in the direction of its endless applications; and thus Pastoral Theology will have the largest share of all in the pastoral life."¹

The pastoral ministry has a business side for which a labor-saving technique has been devised. To be well acquainted with these technical aspects of the pastoral office will stand the pastor in good stead and greatly facilitate his work. If Pastoral Theology gives due attention to these matters of a routine nature, it thereby renders a valuable service. Familiarity with business methods will make it possible for the pastor to meet the problems of external administration with resourcefulness and to settle them with dispatch, leaving him time for the work that touches more closely on the heart of the pastoral office. This heart of the pastoral ministry is the care

¹ "Clerical Studies" (Boston). Substantially in agreement with the learned and pious Sulpician, we cannot wholly accept his estimate of the school of experience. Thus, he writes: "But the great training-school of Pastoral Theology is the experience of life. For, as already observed, Pastoral Theology is not so much a science as an art; the art of arts, St. Gregory calls it, *ars artium regimen animarum*; and, like all arts, it is learned principally by observation and practice. Science supplies only the underlying principles; art teaches how to apply them. Thus, engineering is based on mathematics and the natural sciences; but a perfect knowledge of them does not suffice to make an engineer. Medicine implies a knowledge of the human frame; but the ablest anatomist or physiologist may make a very poor practitioner. In the same way dogmatic, moral and ascetic theology prepare a candidate for the ministry, but do not suffice to fit him for it; and even with the other helps to which we have referred, he still remains very inadequately equipped for his work at the outset" (*op. cit.*). Now, we do not deny that a young priest can and should profit by the experience of his elders, and it is for this very good reason that his superiors usually attach him for some time to an experienced pastor before entrusting to him the administration of a parish. But this does not exclude the necessity of previous practical training. The young physician can, indeed, learn much from an experienced practitioner, but still he is not sent forth without actual practical training. So it is with the young priest. Pastoral Theology begins in the Seminary, but it does not end with ordination. It is the one science from which the priest is never graduated. "Darum soll die Pastoraltheologie eine Bildungsschule sein, welche der Seelsorger nie verlassen darf, weil er in ihr nie ausgelernt hat" (Dr. Cornelius Krieg, "Wissenschaft der Seelenleitung," St. Louis, Mo.).

of souls. The rest is the external setting, the scaffolding subordinated to the primary objective. Quite appropriately, therefore, Bishop William Stang describes the function of Pastoral Theology as follows: "Pastoral Theology is the science which teaches the proper discharging of the various duties of the priest in the care of souls. It is the scientific application of the different branches of theology whose study it presupposes. As a science, it has its rules, directions, and customs, which serve as its principles. Its end is the preparation of the young ecclesiastic for his sublime destiny worthily to represent Christ among the people and to continue the work of His redemption: 'Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, e terris ascensurus ad coelos, sacerdotes sui ipsius vicarios reliquit (Conc. Trid.).'"² In this definition the technique of pastoral administration and the routine work of parish management assume, as is proper, only a subsidiary position.

But even the care of souls itself has an official side and an administrative aspect. The regulation of the parish services and the administration of the Sacraments are bound up with considerable detail of an official and legal character. But these matters, as well as those referred to above, pertain to the narrower and legal concept of the pastoral ministry and do not concern us at the moment. Our concern is the personal aspect of the pastoral office. This is the side to be stressed in connection with the work of convert-making.

THE CARE OF SOULS

The word "ministry" has two connotations. The one implies authority, rule and government. If we take the word in this sense, the pastor is the minister of the Church, that is, its official representative in the parish. He has received the official commission to rule the flock which has been entrusted to him. It is this sense which is chiefly expressed in the term, *regimen animarum*, with its suggestion of jurisdiction. Though the ministry, taken in the sense indicated, is most emphatically for the good of souls, it involves an exercise of authority and constitutes a governmental function. The pastor rules, directs, guides and governs his flock, and the flock responds by obedience and docility.

² "Pastoral Theology" (New York City).

Another meaning, however, is contained in the word. Ministry also conveys the notion of service. Though sometimes obscured by natural human pride, this idea of service is nevertheless essential to the pastoral ministry. The care of souls is the service of souls. The pastor ministers to the spiritual needs of men. He helps and assists men to reach their eternal destiny. To this humbler function of service the Lord gives emphasis when He says: "You know that they who seem to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their princes have power over them. But it is not so among you; but whoever will be greater shall be your minister. And whoever will be the first among you shall be the servant of all. For the Son of Man also is not come to be ministered unto; but to minister and to give His life a redemption of many."⁸ "Servant of souls" is the title in which the pastor should glory, and to minister to the spiritual needs of men ought to be his consuming ambition. At times this service is rendered by official acts and by the exercise of pastoral authority, but at other times it will take on much humbler forms.

Care of souls exercised in behalf of non-Catholics will in the nature of the case be of a non-official character. It will be a purely friendly service of a personal kind, unsupported by the authority derived from the official capacity of the pastor. The means which it utilizes will manifestly have to be of a different kind. If the *virga ferrea* is always a dangerous instrument of the pastoral ministry, it is here totally out of place. The assumption of authority, perfectly legitimate in dealing with members of the parish, will be of no avail in our relations with non-Catholics and will produce no results. The judicial correction employed, *positis ponendis*, with good effect among our own is inapplicable to outsiders, since the exercise of an authority which is not acknowledged invariably creates resentment. Hence, many of the helps on which the pastor may rely in the exercise of his official ministry must be relinquished when he extends the care of souls to outsiders.

Since the care of souls to be exercised in behalf of non-Catholics presents so many unique features, Pastoral Theology will devote to it a separate chapter treating of the norms of procedure that govern this part of the pastor's work. It stands to reason that a

⁸ Mark, x. 42-48.

different procedure is called for because, whereas the members of the flock have with respect to the appointed pastor the relation of subjects to a superior, the non-Catholics are bound to him by no official relation. Here is an uncultivated field and new ground will have to be broken. Even the excellent Pastoral Theology of Dr. Cornelius Krieg is incomplete in this respect.⁴

THE NATURE OF THE CARE OF SOULS

The spiritual ministry of non-Catholics constitutes a special application of the care of souls in general. It, therefore, presupposes a knowledge of the general norms that govern the ways in which we can minister to the spiritual needs of our fellowmen and assist them in the attainment of eternal life. Pastoral Theology, accordingly, will have to enter into a description of the nature, the aims, the forms and the means of the care of souls. This is one of the most helpful services it can render to those who are about to begin their apostolic labors.

The first thing to do is to impress the candidate for the priesthood with the supreme importance and the exalted character of this work. Nothing could be more disastrous than to take the duties of the pastoral ministry lightly and to enter upon them with inadequate preparation. The young priest must fully realize the awful responsibility which he assumes. The burden is almost too heavy for human shoulders and should be accepted with a sense of trepidation, for mistakes made in the exercise of the spiritual ministry may have consequences that reach into eternity. Harm may be done of an irremediable character. Of course, scrupulousness is not to be encouraged, but levity in a matter where such tremendous interests are at stake would verge on the criminal. All writers on the subject accordingly take great pains to instill into the heart of the priest a sober sense of responsibility. To approach the care of souls lightly heartedly bespeaks a shallow mind and foredooms one to utter failure. What a deep sense of responsibility breathes in the words with which St. Gregory the Great opens his immortal *Regula Pas-*

⁴ The fact is that the formal object of Pastoral Theology considered in the traditional manner excludes the consideration of this topic. Hence we have been pleading for an extension of its scope and trust to have shown that such an extension is justified. The "Manual of Pastoral Theology" by the Rev. Frederick Schulze has a chapter on the instruction of converts.

toralis: "Pastoralis curæ me pondera fugere delitescendo voluisse, benigna, frater carissime, atque humili intentione reprehendis; quæ ne quibusdam levia esse videantur, præsentis libri stylo exprimo de eorum gravedine omne, quod penso; ut et hæc, qui vacat, incaute non expetat; et qui incaute expetiit, adeptum se esse pertimescat."⁵

St. Augustine expresses the same sentiments in his letter to Bishop Valerius: "Before all things I ask your pious wisdom to take into consideration that, on the one hand, if the duties of the office of a bishop, or presbyter, or deacon be discharged in a perfunctory and time-serving manner, no work can be in this life more easy, agreeable, and likely to secure the favor of men, especially in our day, but none at the same time more miserable, deplorable, and worthy of condemnation in the sight of God; and, on the the other hand, that if in the office of the bishop, or presbyter, or deacon the orders of the Captain of our salvation be observed, there is no work in this life more difficult, toilsome, and hazardous, especially in our day, but none at the same time more blessed in the sight of God."⁶

The thought of the awfulness of the pastoral ministry and the care of souls recurs again and again in the writings of the Fathers and the Saints. We would not be justified in regarding it merely as a pious exaggeration. It is deeply imbedded in the consciousness of the Church. Thus, Dr. Franz Hettinger writes: "This is the conclusion to which all have come who have considered what a heavy burden was to be laid on their shoulders; they deemed themselves too weak to bear it, the responsibility too great which they were about to take upon themselves, and they trembled at the thought that they would one day have to give an account of their stewardship. . . . I have dwelt at length on the thoughts of St. Gregory of Nazianzus on the office of the priest. They are not words of yesterday or of the day before; they are voices that have sounded through a thousand years and have found an echo in the soul of every noble priest. Read also the six books of St. John Chrysostom 'On the Priesthood,' and the four books of St. Gregory the Great on the *Regula Pastoralis*. You will find that the same ideas recur in them. You will understand that these are not the private opinions of certain individuals, but that it is the spirit of the Church which

■ *Sancti Gregorii Magni Regula Pastoralis.*

⁶ *Ep. xxi.*

speaks in them, which has spoken through the course of so many centuries, which has instructed so many holy priests, zealous pastors, pious shepherds, and strengthened them, and rendered them zealous in their work. Thus, those Saints thought, spoke and acted, who, fearing the burden of pastoral care, at first fled therefrom and then, knowing it to be the will of God, subjected their shoulders to it, and now shine as lights in Holy Church.”⁷

A proper conception of the grandeur of the pastoral ministry and the responsibilities connected with the care of souls is the only sufficient motive that will induce the candidate for the priesthood to prepare himself adequately for the arduous duties of his sacred office, for it must not be left out of sight that this preparatory training is exacting and involves many sacrifices. A lesser motive than the one mentioned will not be equal to the strain put upon it. Students who are not sustained by this exalted motive will but too soon grow weary of their studies and become lax in their efforts at spiritual self-improvement. They will be content with the minimum measure of knowledge, if indeed they acquire that much, and satisfied with a low degree of virtue.

The grandeur of the care of souls, as understood by the Catholic Church, is derived from the fact that it is a continuation of the ministry of Christ itself. It is a vicarious ministry to be carried on in His name and according to the norms which He has laid down. Far from being a man-made institution, it is divine in origin and supernatural in its orientation. A serviceable definition which brings out in due relief the supernatural elements has been elaborated by Dr. Krieg. It reads: “The care of souls collectively taken denotes those activities of the rightly ordained and authorized ministers of the Church, by which they apply in the name of Christ and the Church the fruits of redemption to the souls of men.”⁸ This circumstance that the care of souls is in reality the work of Christ vicariously performed by the priest places it on the highest conceivable plane and makes it transcend all merely human activity. For the conscientious performance of this work the priest is immediately responsible to Him whom he represents.

The object towards which the care of souls is directed likewise

⁷ “Timothy or Letters to a Young Theologian” (St. Louis, Mo.).

■ *Op. cit.*

invests it with a supreme dignity. The divine ministry has to do with souls, and its great concern is to save them from eternal ruin. Nothing could be grander. In the estimate of God the soul is of priceless value. It is His masterpiece, and to win it He goes to infinite pains. On the other hand, eternal perdition is the culmination of all tragedy, a lot too horrible to contemplate. Nothing more is needed to illustrate the dignity and value of the divine ministry. The subject was a favorite theme of St. John Chrysostom, and never does his eloquence rise to loftier heights than when he deals with this topic. Let us listen to his inspiring words: "Though thou bestowest immense riches on the poor, thou doest more in converting a single soul. Why? Because nothing is so pleasing to God and so much His care as the salvation of souls. . . . What is equivalent to the care of souls? Neither fasting, nor sleeping on the ground, nor vigils nor anything else can equal it."

The care of souls, then, is the greatest thing to which we can devote our energies and our life. There is something sacramental about it, something truly divine. We understand without difficulty why St. Gregory the Great calls the care of souls the art of arts. We also understand why these words have again and again been borrowed by other writers until they have swelled to a gigantic chorus reëchoing through all the ages of the Church and beating on our ears with commanding and majestic instance.

If the aspirant to the sacred ministry learns from Pastoral Theology the supreme dignity and the overshadowing importance of the care of souls, he has learned a lesson of paramount value, basic to his entire priestly life.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

PERSONALITIES IN PREACHING

By THE RIGHT REV. MSGR. H. T. HENRY, Litt.D.

The word *personality* has various meanings. This paper uses the word in that plural form which often stands for disparaging comment upon others.

The previous paper commended patience in preaching. Impatience may lead us to indulge in personalities in the pulpit. In "La Prédication," Father Longhayé says that even favorable remarks about others are out of place in the pulpit: "Personalities, even if they be of a most complimentary kind, come with poor grace from the pulpit; and even Bourdaloue erred greatly, in my humble opinion, if, as Madame de Sévigné would have it, he once described in three points the conversion of Treville." If we are hardly permitted to compliment a person even indirectly in our sermons, it is clearly less permissible to utter anything against him, whether formally or implicitly.

I

There are, first of all, the personalities that find their opportunity and source during our preaching. I find a humorous illustration in Lecoy de la Marche's "La Chaire Française au Moyen Age." Jacques de Vitry had been declaiming on one occasion against the wickedness of women, and noticed that several of those present were beginning to turn away from him. "Do you now want me," he asked, "to speak of the good woman? I will speak of this old woman whom I see asleep. . . . For God's sake, if any one has a pin, let him wake her up: people who sleep during the sermon take good care not to sleep at meals." There was humor and comment alike in this sally, and under all the circumstances of the case the preacher could be pardoned. Meanwhile, there could hardly be any unpleasant sting (unless the pin were actually used) in the unforeseen event.

There was a sting, however, in the remonstrance uttered by the chancellor in Notre Dame who, in 1273, reproached certain citizens for turning their backs on the preacher as soon as they saw him, and leaving the church as he was mounting the pulpit. He flung after them: "That's what frogs do when the vine is in flower: the

perfume either drives them away or kills them, just as the sweetness of God's word sets those citizens flying." Here again there was some apparent justification for the reproach. We can only hope that it was uttered in such a way as to obviate the suspicion that the preacher was indulging anger at what he considered as a personal affront. He might better have waited until such a disorderly crowd had left the church, and then taken occasion to comment quietly on the danger of shutting one's ears to the words of the Gospel of Christ. Such a quiet remonstrance would certainly come at length to the ears of the dissidents and affect them better than did the angry fling at their departing backs.

We are spared such indecorum on the part of our people. They do not leave the church just before the sermon, although some persons come strolling in after the sermon is ended. Amidst our homiletic tribulations we can accordingly console ourselves that we do not have to close the doors of the church to keep people in for the sermon, as St. Cæsarius of Arles thought it necessary to do in his far-off days: "*Ne quis vero ante sermonem de templo exiret, S. Cæsarius Arelatensis sæpissime ostia post evangelia claudi fecit, teste Cypriano in ejus vita*" (Martène, "*Antiq. eccl. rit.*," I, 380). A milder method was employed once by Robert of Sorbonne on Easter Day. He said he would be brief, like the Gospel itself of the day: "I know that today you wish to have a short sermon and a long dinner, and I will preach briefly if I can." What would be our course of action if that were to come to pass which de la Marche recalls having witnessed at the little village of Berry, and which he supposed to be traditional there, namely, to see all the men go out before the sermon and return when it was finished? In what personalities should we then be inclined to indulge?

II

In his "Pastoral Theology," Dr. Stang says: "Never mention persons nor allude to individuals, censuring them or finding fault with them. It could not produce any good, but cause injury to others and yourself." As a general counsel this appears to be good, since a preacher may be too zealous at times. One illustration can be found in a sermon of the famous fifteenth-century preacher, Olivier Maillard:

"Preaching one day at Toulouse before the Parliament, our orator pictured so vividly the character of an unjust judge and made such an obvious application to several members of this Company that his arrest was under consideration. Meanwhile, the Archbishop forbade him to preach for some time. Maillard accepted the rebuke in a spirit of penitence. But he went still farther, and threw himself at the feet of the magistrates who believed themselves insulted, mingling, however, with his apologies such a strong and touching representation of the sad state of hardened sinners, that he obtained as a suppliant what he had missed as a preacher of the word of God. These judges were converted in a most striking fashion. They resigned their posts, and one of them entered a severe religious order" (Philomneste, "*Predicatoriana*," p. 83).

The net result here was excellent, indeed, but withal extraordinary, and may simply serve to illustrate the old maxim that bids us admire but not imitate—unless, perhaps, the circumstances of his times and his auditory should be like ours, and our humility and touching eloquence like those of the famous Franciscan, Olivier Maillard.

The general character of the fifteenth century seems to have been very different from that of our day. It was then that Barletta, the famous Dominican preacher, assailed the corruptions of his times with unsparing vigor, including in his various denunciations all ranks of the clergy. A contemporary writer declared that Barletta did not preach the sermons accredited to him, arguing that the sermons published under his name were composed by a poor imitator of the popular preacher.

Another preacher of the same century, Michael Menot, indulged in similar denunciatory preachments, as did an Augustinian named Jacques-le-Grand. This latter, preaching before the Queen of France, painted a picture of the Court in such descriptive terms that everybody forthwith understood him. The Queen-Mother herself was not spared, the preacher several times directly addressing her. Word of all this was brought to King Charles VI, who only laughed and said that he wished to hear the preacher again on Pentecost Sunday. He ultimately had a similar dose administered to himself directly by the preacher who said that what the King's courtiers dared not tell him should nevertheless be told—namely, his negligence in ruling his kingdom. The Duke of Orleans received a

worse castigation. The King merely commented that the preacher had done well, and that he himself wished to profit by the sermon.

It may well be that such personalities in the pulpit were the surest way to effect reforms in olden times. *Tempora mutantur*, and in our circumstances we may not employ them with any hope of profit, but rather with a justified fear of evil results to others and to ourselves.

Meanwhile, vice must be rebuked, scandals must be removed, virtue must be inculcated. We may not be pussyfooters. And too many people will tolerate, and some people will probably enjoy, a heartfelt exhortation that applies only to themselves, if they could but recognize the fact. They will really laugh at the fool's cap that fits no head but their own. How shall the affair be managed so expertly as to make such folk enter into themselves without feeling the shame of being made a "horrible example" for the whole parish to gloat over? Elsewhere in his volume, Dr. Stang cautions priests never to preach on vice but instead on the opposite virtue. This advice seems good, for our congregations need encouragement rather than denunciation. As a rule, the people are striving, in the midst of many adverse conditions, to be at least "fairly" good. The wandering sheep can best be corralled by judicious neighbors for a parish mission or by pastoral visits conceived in a friendly spirit.

III

Perhaps the most unpleasant of all personalities in the pulpit are those that concern the relations of the pastor with his flock. Dr. Stang warns us: "Never resent in the pulpit any personal injury. You are in God's place: forget yourself completely. Erase the letter 'I' from your vocabulary."

Harboring resentment is universally decried as simply foolish, even from a worldly point of view. "Laugh, and the world laughs with you. Weep, and you weep alone." So sang one of our American versifiers. It may seem amazing to a person who is smarting under an injury (real or fancied) that the whole world of his acquaintances seems unable to enter into the spirit of the tragedy. The fact is, of course, that his own judgment is apt to be seriously at fault, since anger distorts everything out of a proper perspective. And again, most people have their own little tragedies to contem-

plate, and may wonder that we make so much out of a trifle. For what to us is a mountain seems to our friends but a molehill.

The preacher is human, and cannot escape the first reaction of angry emotion common to all animals when something untoward occurs. But he is supposed, as a priest, to have trained himself in the business of self-conquest through years of ascetical practices in the seminary or in the novitiate. The little foibles of humanity must be like water on a duck's back in so far as he is concerned. What, then, must be the amazement of a congregation to behold their priests quite as open to the foibles of irritation as the meanest of their flock? And the wonder grows when it is perceived that a priest has yielded, not merely to the first natural reaction, but evidently to many subsequent ones in the same single case of irritation—for he comes with this load of angry feelings into the pulpit itself and unloads it formally on the whole congregation. He has had plenty of time, between what he considers an affront to his own dignity and the time when he chooses to discourse about it in public, to master himself and to preserve the dignity both of his manhood and of his priesthood. Like a child, however, he must bawl his little griefs into the ears of the whole neighborhood. And the singularly curious thing can hardly fail to happen, namely, that this self-exoneration is pitifully inadequate from any logical point of view, since, as has been noted above, his irritation clouds his mental vision in such wise that a mere shadow becomes to him like the Giant of the Brocken in its menace and its immensity.

An illustration is appropriate here. A priest tells of a touring party finding, on a country road, a man seriously hurt in an automobile accident. He is apparently dying, and he may be a Catholic. Using a telephone in a nearby farmhouse, one of the tourists informs the operator of the accident, and begs her to summon the nearest Catholic pastor. He is informed that the telephone is a private one and that she is forbidden to call that number. The gentleman pleads the Catholic viewpoint in such a case, and implores the operator to forget the rule in the present extreme emergency. She does so (being herself probably a Catholic), and the pastor arrives quickly, finds the dying man is a Catholic, and administers the Last Sacraments before death ensues. The gentleman is charmed at the finely prompt service given both by the operator and the pastor, but is

later amazed that, on the following Sunday, the pastor denounces the operator for her action, and threatens that he will have her discharged for violating a stringent rule of her Company. It is an amazing anecdote, although told with more circumstantial detail than needs to be given here. The private wire was sacrosanct, a priest's comfort was invaded—and therefore the fulminations from the pulpit on the following Sunday. A just comment on the whole incident baffles adequate expression. But the good pastor, in his irritation at being disturbed, simply was unable to perceive how bitterly his own denunciations arraigned himself before the bar of public opinion.

Less culpable, indeed, is the momentary irritation displayed by a preacher when his sermon contends with present difficulties. Dr. Stang warns him: "Do not interrupt your sermon to rebuke people who cough, laugh, talk, or come late; such comments are sure to spoil the goods effects of your preaching." The self-control of the preacher is itself, in such cases, a silent sermon, while the occasional surprised look on the faces of the people who are near the disturber may prove a good lay-sermon to the impolite disturbers of the peace.

Perhaps this whole matter is more satisfactorily handled abroad. The Code of Canon Law is silent about it, although our own Councils of Baltimore made rather much of it, as though we, in our own circumstances of time and place, stood much in need of counsel in the matter.

II. GOD AND EVOLUTION

An Interpretation of the Implications of Evolution

By JOHN A. O'BRIEN, Ph.D.

The publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species" in 1859 has been generally regarded as having sounded the death knell of the idea of purpose or plan in nature and in the universe. "Chance variation" and the "survival of the fittest," operating through long periods of time, were invoked to explain the origin of every form of life upon the earth from the microscopic amoeba to man himself. Huxley, the popularizer of Darwin for the English-speaking world, made evolution serve as the foundation for his philosophy of agnosticism. Haeckel, the interpreter of Darwinism for the German-speaking countries, went one step further, using evolution as a bludgeon to drive out of the minds of the masses such fundamental concepts of religion as belief in a personal God, human immortality and freedom of the will. Concepts of life and of human destiny as portrayed by Christianity, as well as belief in a God other than "cosmic matter," were not only held up to ridicule but were represented as archaic survivals of an uncritical age which scientific discoveries relegated to the scrap heap.

Writing to the London *Times* in 1876, Carlyle draws a vivid picture of the pessimism and half-despair of finding any meaning in life and any purpose in the universe which followed in the wake of Darwinian evolution. "Ah, it is a sad and terrible thing," he writes, "to see nigh a whole generation of men and women professing to be cultivated, looking around in purblind fashion and finding no God in this universe. I suppose it is a reaction from the reign of cant and hollow pretense, professing to believe what in fact they do not; and this is what we have got: all things from frog spawn, the gospel of dirt the order of the day. The older I grow—and I now stand on the brink of eternity—the more comes back to me the sentence in the Catechism which I learned when a child, and the fuller and deeper its meaning becomes: 'What is the great end of man? To glorify God and enjoy Him forever.' No gospel

of dirt, teaching that men have descended from frogs through monkeys, can ever set that aside."¹

Now that the hysteria and emotional excitement following upon the spread of ideas of Darwinian evolution have subsided, and scholars are calmly interpreting the bearing of evolution upon religion, it is interesting to inquire into the factors which led millions of people to surrender the idea of God and purpose in nature and in the universe. For, with the yielding of this idea, the concept of a Deity not only became obscured, but He was well nigh ruled out of the universe as no longer necessary to explain its administration. There is much of this reasoning that obtains at the present day. Let us, then, examine the factors which led to the discarding of the idea of purpose in nature, and then let us trace the real bearing of evolution upon the concept of God and its significance for contemporary religious thought.

The writer would suggest four factors which loom up large in explaining the stampede of vast multitudes of believing Christians, including many theistic philosophers, into the surrender of the idea of purpose in nature. First, the general attitude resulting from the presentation of Darwinian evolution with its new worldview, and the upsetting of the traditional concept of a static world with its species fixed and unchangeable, was panicky and bewildered. This state of panic was not lessened by the raucous and confident vociferations of many of Darwin's followers, such as Haeckel, that evolution effectually consigned the whole Christian cosmogony to the rubbish heap. The result was a failure to distinguish carefully between the newly discovered *facts* of evolution and their philosophic *interpretation*. Forced by the growing evidence into an admission of the scientific data of evolution, they fell victims to this particular philosophic fallacy which was wrapped in the habiliments of evolution and passed as an integral part of the scientific dogma. The disturbed emotional state was not conducive to the cold and dispassionate sifting of the proved from the unproved, of the chaff from the wheat.

The second factor was undoubtedly the anthropomorphic manner

¹ "Twenty-eighth Annual Archæological Report" of the Ontario Provincial Museum, pp. 61, 62.

of conceiving God as a Master Mechanic who perfected by direct action all the adjustments in nature, and in this manner devised the origin of all new species—a mode of conceiving the Deity which obtained largely down to the middle of the nineteenth century. The direct personal action of the Deity was seen in every phenomenon of nature. The spread of the evolutionary concept of nature as effecting adjustments in the organism by the action of merely natural forces without any special divine intervention seemed to remove the Deity farther from the administration of the universe, and served to give to nature, operating through the laws of chance variation and natural selection, the capacity to effect all the necessary adaptations to environment, even amounting to the originating of new species.

Thus, nature took on the concept of a machine operated by its own energy, making its own adjustments without being guided by an external agent who pulled the lever this way and that to turn out products according to the pattern or purpose in his mind. The concept of God as *immanent* in nature, attaining ends through the operation of natural laws which hold universal sway through the material universe rather than by direct personal intervention, was to come into general acceptance only as a result of the further researches of natural science.

The third factor is the human tendency of concluding, when once the glamor of mystery is rubbed away by the discovery of *how* an effect is accomplished, that the achievement is no longer striking or even expressive of intelligent direction in the cause. When evolution showed that adjustments were not suddenly fabricated but were the result of a slow gradual process running through many generations before they were perfected, somehow the wonder of the adaptations apparent in nature seemed to be dissipated—tarnished by the cold “light of common day.”

The fourth factor is obviously the failure to think through the meaning and the implications of the principle of natural selection—the failure to perceive that it begs the whole question of origins, and assumes the adaptation as already effected before it begins its ruthless operations, killing off the unfit and permitting the fit to survive but never giving birth to them.

PENDULUM OF SCIENCE SWINGS TO PURPOSE

It is interesting to note that at the present day the fallacy of the reasoning that natural selection sounded the death knell of the teleological argument is becoming more generally recognized. It is doubly interesting to observe that most prominent in disclaiming any weakening of the argument from design by evolution are some of the outstanding scientists in this very field. Thus, in 1924 when many theistic philosophers were speaking softly concerning teleology or passing over it as though they were strangers who acknowledged no acquaintance or friendship for it, the distinguished scientist, Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn, declared: "So long as the chance or fortuitous hypothesis of adaptation reigned, Paley's argument for the existence of God was set aside, but our more profound knowledge of creative evolution, gained by direct observation of Nature, leaves Paley's argument just as strong as it ever was. Paley's 'Evidences' may be challenged now no more effectively than they could be challenged in 1858. . . . Many biologists have entirely abandoned mechanistic theories of adaptation and have frankly revived the old purposive interpretation of Nature, in the guise of vitalism or *élan vital*. I do not belong to any of these schools, but, if I have made a single contribution to biology which I feel confident is permanent, it is the profession that living Nature is purposive; it is the profession that Democritus was wrong in raising the hypothesis of fortuity, and that Aristotle was right in claiming that the order of living things as we know them preclude fortuity and demonstrates purpose."²

Similar, likewise, is the conclusion reached after a lifetime of painstaking research by the eminent English physiologist, Professor Haldane, in rejecting the mechanistic theory of life "because it involves quite impossible assumptions and leads us nowhere in respect to the characteristic phenomena of life. Not only the newspapers, but also scientific men, continue to speak of the mechanism of life and heredity; I confess that such an expression has no meaning whatsoever to me. We cannot dispense with the distinctive conception of life."³

² H. F. Osborn, "Evolution and Religion in Education," pp. 62, 91.

³ J. S. Haldane, "Biology and Religion," in *The Modern Churchman* (1924), XIV, 274. Published by Basil Blackwell, Oxford, England.

That the cogency of the teleological argument has been in no wise weakened by evolution in general or by the principle of natural selection in particular, is also the conclusion finally reached by the great naturalist, Professor Le Conte, who asserts: "Adaptation of means to ends is in our experience the result of thought, and we can not conceive it to result otherwise. The effect of science can not be to destroy this primary conception—which indeed, like all primary conceptions, is ineradicable, and already more certain than anything can be made by proof—but only to exalt and purify our conceptions of the designer. For, observe: in any case of *adaptive* structure, whether in the animal body or in planetary relations, the evidence of design is not in the materials, but in the *use* of the materials; not in the *parts*, but in the *adjustment* of the part for a purpose. Design, purpose, adjustment, *adaptation*, are not material things, but relations or intellectual things, and therefore perceivable only by thought, and conceivable only as the result of thought. It is simply impossible to talk about such adaptive structures without using language which implies design. The very word '*adaptive*' implies it. It is impossible even to think of such structures without implicitly assuming intelligence as the cause. It makes no particle of difference *how* the material originated, or whether it ever originated at all; it matters not whether the adaptation was done at once out of hand, or whether by slow process of modification; it matters not whether the adaptive modification was brought about by a process of natural selection, or by pressure of a physical environment; whether without law or according to law. The removal of the result from manlike directness of separate action can not destroy the idea of design, but only modify our conception of the Designer. What science, and especially evolution, destroys, therefore, is not the idea of design, but only our low anthropomorphic notions of the mode of working of the Designer."⁴

TWO PATHS TO THE SAME GOAL

The conclusions of the eminent scientists which have just been presented may be said to reflect the viewpoint which has come into the ascendancy in scientific circles in recent years. It is the conclusion which becomes inevitable when one thinks through care-

⁴ Le Conte, "Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought," pp. 345-6.

fully the philosophic implications of the principle of natural selection and its twin brother, the principle of chance variation. This, too, is the conclusion which is now unquestionably the dominant one among the leaders in philosophic thought. There are probably few, if any, among the students of the philosophy of religion who will dissent from the following reasoned statement of Bishop Gore of Oxford: "I think it is true to say that in the two generations full of constant discussion which have now passed since Darwin's 'Origin of Species' appeared, the idea that the world of organized life can be accounted for by nothing but 'natural selection' and 'sexual selection' acting upon the material supplied by chance variations has become less and less probable. Grant to these agencies all the force they can be allowed to have had, it seems impossible to account for progressive evolution of living forms unless some sort of direction, some sort of organic tendency to become this or that, is assumed in nature—which suggests irresistibly a progressive purpose in the world of living things, which has found for the present its culmination and interpretation in man. In fact, we are driven back for our interpretation of nature upon the principle first clearly enunciated by Aristotle that the essence of anything or its real meaning is only manifest when it has reached its full growth. We are to interpret the beginning in the light of the end; not the end in the light of the beginning."⁵

Now that the hue and cry raised by those who claimed almost omnipotent power for the principle of natural selection has largely died down, and the pendulum has swung back from a mechanistic conception of nature to one in which design and purpose are ineradicably imprinted, it is interesting to note that the father of the principle of natural selection, Charles Darwin himself, entertained not only grave doubts but complete skepticism about the ability of his followers to explain the universe and its phenomena on the basis of these mechanistic principles of evolution without reference to the operation of an intelligent cause giving meaning and purpose to the activities of nature.

In 1878 Darwin wrote to his friend and disciple, Romanes, who had recently published a book which seemed to consign the idea of

² Charles Gore, "Belief in God" (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1926), p. 60.

design to the limbo of exploded myths, never to return to stalk abroad in the world of living men again: "I should like some time to hear . . . what you would say if a theologian addressed you as follows: 'I grant you the attraction of gravitation, persistence of force (or conservation of energy), and one kind of matter, though the latter is an immense admission; but I maintain that God must have given such attributes to this force, independently of its persistence, that under certain conditions it develops or changes into light, heat, electricity, galvanism, perhaps even life. . . . Again I maintain that matter, though it may in the future be eternal, was created by God with the most marvelous affinities. . . . If you say that nebulous matter existed aboriginally and from eternity with all its present complex powers in a potential state, you seem to me to beg the whole question.' Please observe that it is not I but a theologian who has thus addressed you, but I could not answer him."⁶

The day, however, was one in which the evolutionist held the center of the stage, gripping the imagination with his tales of enchanting discoveries in the world of organic life, while the theologian was pushed off into the wings. He had held the spotlight for centuries past, and the world was ready and hungry for a new voice and a new story. Now that the main outline of the story has been told, the goal towards which it leads does not seem to differ essentially from the one traced by the theologian. For seventy-five years of scientific research in evolution afford no grounds to alter the analysis of both stories made by Samuel Butler, a contemporary of Darwin: "The man of science begins with *tabula rasæ*, gropes his way to evolution, thence to purposive evolution, thence to the omnipresence of mind and design in the universe. What is this but God? The theologian begins with God and is driven to evolution. *Par divers moyens on arrive à pareille fin.*"⁷

Indeed, the conclusion may be drawn that the converging results of seventy-five years of painstaking scientific research in all the fields supplying data on evolution serve but to disclose that the words "purpose" and "plan" are written into the very heart and

⁶ "Life and Letters of J. G. Romanes," pp. 88-89.

⁷ H. F. Jones, "Samuel Butler: A Memoir," p. 372.

framework of the material universe as well as into all the far-flung operations of nature, from the microscopic cell to the most distant star. Where there exists purpose, there must exist an intelligence that conceives the end purposed in the evolutionary process. This is but another way of saying that evolution, far from removing a Supreme Intelligence from the world of nature, renders it forever inexplicable on any other basis. Instead of undermining faith in God, evolution properly interpreted reinforces that belief more strongly than any scientific discovery within the last century.

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

By C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., M.A.

X. "Hearing Them and Asking Them Questions"

When Our Lord was twelve, He spent those well-known days in the Temple listening to elderly rabbis and asking them questions as a demure disciple was expected to do. There is not the slightest reason for supposing that He agreed with their answers; nor yet that He displayed His disagreement, if He did disagree.

Quite probably a number of the rabbis may have been satisfied with this young man: He showed due respect to His elders and to tradition. Others, unless human nature has changed a lot even in the East, would probably have snubbed Him on the general ground that the young ought to be kept in their proper place. Some may have broken forth into loud acclamations—as Jews do—of the proficiency and promise of the lad. A lad of sense usually sees through an unmerited snub, though he will turn hot and cold at the thought of one that he sees (perhaps in the middle of the night, when his high ardor has cooled down a little) he has thoroughly well deserved. He also ought to feel rather a fool if he is openly and exorbitantly praised; but I confess that I have met youths who can swallow whole gallons of melted butter. What does exasperate a young man of balance is to be patronized—or to be "encouraged, yet not allowed to be conceited." One of my first and sharpest lessons in cynicism was to have my small-boyish drawings or what not praised (relatives did praise them, because they felt it their duty to encourage) in the formula: "Yes, dear, it's quite nicely drawn—for *you*." I used to wait for that little appendix, and it was very bad for me to hear it.

A young priest, to start with that end, is able to be tolerable. I must say that most seem to me very nice young men, aware of their lack of experience, and using their text-book formulas very loyally in (for example) the confessional, and keeping quiet at meals and not doing things without asking leave first. But without any doubt some do arrive at their billet as hearty, unlicked cubs, quite sure that they can not only show the laity all about it but put their rector wise upon most subjects. A large part of the English

"youth," when judging an older man, starts from the *principle*: "Being older, he is more probably wrong than not." This applies generally, and not only ecclesiastically. It is true that the post-war excess of this here is rapidly dying down to those pre-war dimensions which are, I suppose, normal. For all young men are bound to think their elders rather suffocating. But I believe it is certain that an honest young priest is simply astounded, as a rule, at the end of one year, if he has but simply held his tongue, watched, and learned. His perspective will already be so different. The ruthless rectangularity of text-book life will have already been made so curved, so flexible, he indeed fears (if he is a humble lad) that life is a labyrinth. At the end of five years more, he will hardly be able to imagine himself back into even that dawn of experience; he will be wondering how in the world he dared to take his seat in the confessional—to proclaim to men and women of adult years that this or that was right and alone right, because it was the only application he could see of the principles learnt in the seminary. And he will crawl with horror at the memory of how he wanted his superiors to be constantly changing things: he will suddenly realize how patient they had been with him—what a lot of the calf in him they put up with. I would go so far as to suggest that no one, even an adult priest, a new rector, arriving in a district, would be wise to change anything at all for six months at least, that is, until he has learnt, not only what really existed (not merely *seemed* to exist) in his new parish, but why it had come into existence and had stereotyped itself.

We now have to look at the other side. I have recently been told that a small operation inflicted on me would have been trivial had I been five years old; would have been a grave-ish affair had I been 25; was a quite serious proposition now that I am in the fifties, and would occasion a general shock quite out of proportion to its actual difficulty. We, without doubt, get set. We may become not only irritating but really harmful. People are constantly preaching about the hot-headed sins of youth: when youth is over, and men no longer commit them, but settle down, we are apt to say: "Here is a solid citizen. Here is a man who can be relied upon: nothing erratic *here!*" But he may merely have got into his rut, have settled into his shape. He may find it harder to commit this sin or that than not to commit it; in fact, he may be doing right *by custom*

on exactly the same platform of merit as a young man may do wrong because it is new. I assure you that I know plenty of priests who have developed the custom of submitting to such and such a housekeeper. When they move into a new parish, they bring their housekeeper too, partly because they would be lost without her, and also because they would never dream of daring to suggest her departure. And the young curates among whom they come are quite as inquisitive about and terrified of the customs of their new rector's housekeeper as of the rector's own. Possibly I may be clear when I say that I am far more afraid of the deadening, de-spiritualizing habit-of-life of middle-aged men in the poorer parts of great cities, or even in the respectable parts of them, than I am of the violent and explosive sins of their sons. Such sins may have nothing to do with character: but the older men are, right down into character, despiritualized. Hence I often pray that I may gain indeed experience but never lose imagination, for, as I think I said, without imagination you will have no sympathy, and without sympathy you will be no good at training curates or anyone else in the world.

My feeling, then, is that young priests will have plenty of "new ideas" (which all new young priests have always had), and it would be appalling if young brains were so stupefied as not to have them. They may quite likely, too, have ideas seventy-five per cent of which are impracticable and will never come to anything; but if they cannot carry them to their superiors and be sure not only of a sympathetic hearing but of a good probability that the valuable twenty-five per cent will be made use of, a great deal of wastage will be going on in our world. On the one hand, a young man will feel pretty dismal if only twenty-five per cent of what he hoped comes off; but, as a matter of fact he ought to be fairly pleased, as life goes on, if he finds that five per cent has realized itself. If, however, our elderly, churlish curmudgeonhood prevents our attending to the twenty-five per cent and taking in hand what may lead at least to the five per cent, Our Lord will not be in the least pleased, nor will we have imitated Him. John and James were impulsive young "whole-hoggers," and Our Lord must often have smiled broadly at them: "Will you give us anything we ask?" "Well, what is it?" "To be the two first-up in Your Government." And with their mother drifting round, making it so much harder to say "No"!

But did He snub them out of existence? Did He snub Levi, who invited Him to dinner with a really unexpected crowd? If even after Pentecost Peter needed a whole vision to himself to make him understand the situation as regards the Gentiles, how much are we to suppose Peter understood of Our Lord's real intentions during His lifetime? And the melancholy Thomas, and the slinking Nicodemus, who came out so well at the finish. And even Judas, of whom Our Lord might have made so much if only . . . if only!

Be sure, be absolutely sure, that we can never be satisfied with ourselves because we are 25, 45, 60. Each age has its dangers and disabilities: and if I, at 50, do not think I am going to transform human nature by some magic formula or novel suggestion, I must not, for that, imagine that *no* formula, *no* suggestion, can be offered by perhaps a young man who has the impertinence to be 20 years younger than I am. I have received enough letters from young priests saying: "I am allowed to be nothing—nothing. I am a mere sacrament-machine: O, why did you set up such splendid visions in the retreat you gave our seminary 3 years ago?" to make me sure that, while I must pacify my correspondent, he may be going through a very hard, a wastefully hard, an illegitimately hard time.

May our years be in God's hands!

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

By HUGH COGAN, D.D.

It is a very great convenience to a priest to have ready at hand good and clear editions of the various Books of the Bible. The careful editing and publishing of all the Books of the New and select Books of the Old Testament is a work which received special praise from Pope Benedict XV in his Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus." In English we are already fairly well provided with such editions of the New Testament by Catholic scholars, so that anyone who wishes may procure well-printed and conveniently arranged texts furnished with really helpful introductions and notes. But for the Old Testament, with the exception of the Psalms, little or nothing has yet been done to provide for the needs of English-speaking Catholics,¹ and until the new Westminster version appears, all that is available is the Douai text. In the meantime, every priest with little labor and much profit may prepare his own editions of individual Books of the Old Testament. Called as he is to the ministry of the word, he will find in the Old Testament many a page that may be preached unchanged to his people. If he care to seek, he will find in abundance maxims, proverbs, essays and exhortations on religious and moral subjects for the right ordering of his own life and the sanctification of his soul. This is more particularly the case in those Books which are known as didactic or wisdom Books, for they have as their aim to teach wisdom. He will not find in them the perfection of the Gospel, but he will find a standard of life and conduct that is not reached by many a Christian, and he will find guidance to attain to the perfection of the Gospel.

To show how a priest may prepare a readable and handy text for himself, some examples will here be given from the Book of Proverbs. This is a book rich in instructions of all kinds, and is described by St. Jerome in two words, *mores corrigit*. The same holy Doctor, writing to Læta, exhorts her to read it so that *in Proverbiis Salomonis erudiatur ad vitam*. In preparing our text of the Book we must not seek in it the same sequence of thought and narrative

¹ Except "The Book of Exodus," by Rev. Henry J. Grimmelsman (Cincinnati, 1927).

as is found in the historical Books. It is not a continuous treatise by one author; it is a collection of inspired writings by various authors. The two main portions of the book—Chapters x-xxii. 16 and Chapters xxv-xxix, from which principally it derives its title—are certainly the work of Solomon. In these two portions are recorded about 500 proverbs, expressed in couplets or distichs, and dealing with all manner of subjects both theoretical and practical. The first nine Chapters are completely different in character, being poems of varying length on the origin, excellence, pursuit and practice of wisdom, each poem being complete in itself. The remaining parts of the Book contain short pieces by various authors: The Wise, Agur the Son of Jakeh, Lamuel.

With these general notions recalled to mind, it is an easy matter to divide up the Douai text with appropriate headings and copy it out into a notebook of convenient size. A few examples taken from different parts of the book are here reproduced.

TITLE AND SCOPE OF THE BOOK

The Parables of Solomon, the Son of David, king of Israel:

To know wisdom and instruction;
To understand the words of prudence;
And to receive the instruction of doctrine,
Justice, and judgment, and equity;
To give subtilty to little ones,
To the young man knowledge and understanding.
A wise man shall hear and shall be wiser,
And he that understandeth shall possess governments;
He shall understand a parable and the interpretation,
The words of the wise and their mysterious sayings.
The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom;
Fools despise wisdom and instruction.

Here we have the Title and Scope of the Book, and in verse 7 a motto which sums up the whole contents. While writing the above verses neatly, and in our best handwriting, in an octavo notebook of about 200 pages, our mind has been digesting what we write. We become aware what a rich feast is promised to us, if we only read the Book attentively. In it we shall find wisdom in all its forms: prudence, justice, equity, knowledge and understanding. If we are only inexperienced beginners, then this is the very Book we require. And

even if we have already made some progress, if we can boast of some store of wisdom and intelligence, the Book of Proverbs will increase our store, and guide us still further to a more perfect knowledge. The whole meaning is clear to us and no commentary is required. There is only one word that might be changed, *viz.*, *governments* in verse 5. "To possess governments" is a rather puzzling phrase. St. Jerome has *gubernacula* to render the Hebrew word, and that at once suggests to us the English equivalent *guidance*: the intelligent man shall receive guidance to enable him to understand parables, wise sayings and enigmas. In verse 4 put *shrewdness* instead of *subtilty*, and remember that *little ones* always means *simple, inexperienced people*.

Another example may be taken from Chapter iv. 10-19, and entitled

THE TWO PATHS

Hear, O my son, and receive my words,
That years of life may be multiplied to thee.
I will show thee the way of wisdom,
I will lead thee by the paths of equity,
Which when thou shalt have entered thy steps shall not be straitened,
And when thou runnest, thou shalt not meet a stumbling-block.
Take hold on instruction, leave it not;
Keep it, because it is thy life.

Be not delighted in the paths of the wicked,
Neither let the way of evil men please thee.
Flee from it, pass not by it;
Go aside, and forsake it.
For they sleep not except they have done evil,
And their sleep is taken away unless they have made some to fall;
They eat the bread of wickedness,
And drink the wine of iniquity.

But the path of the just as a shining light
Goeth forwards, and increaseth even to perfect day.
The way of the wicked is darksome:
They know not where they fall.

Again there is no need of a commentary. The ideas are all clear, and the Douai version is quite adequate. Verse 17 has been inter-

preted in two ways: (1) their food and drink is ill-gotten; (2) they commit iniquity with as much unconcern as they eat and drink. Verse 18 gives a beautiful picture of the growth of holy souls in perfection. They proceed from virtue to virtue and from grace to grace, just as the first light of dawn develops gradually to the full splendor of the noonday sun.

"In this verse," says St. Thomas in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, "the whole life of the Saints is revealed to us from a triple point of view. First its austerity, in the simple word, *path*; for, says Jesus, 'strait is the way that leadeth to life' (Matt., vii. 14). Then its shining is signified by this 'shining light,' of which mention is made to the Ephesians (v. 8): 'You were heretofore darkness, but now light in the Lord.' Are not the just sources of light, and is not their life a torch? Finally the life of the Saints is shown in its continual progress."

"This verse," St. Thomas continues, "sums up the whole Letter to the Philippians. They had entered on the right way, the way of Christ, and for love of Him they were enduring many tribulations. Further, they were enlightened by faith, seeing that they deserved this commendation: 'You shine as lights in the world' (ii. 15). Finally, their progress was continuous as the Epistle shows from beginning to end."

From this first part of the Book of Proverbs we will take one more example, Chapter ix. 1-6:

THE BANQUET OF WISDOM

Wisdom hath built herself a house,
 She hath hewn her out seven pillars,
 She hath slain her victims, mingled her wine,
 And set forth her table.
 She hath sent her maids to invite
 To the tower, and to the walls of the city:
 "Whosoever is a little one, let him come to me."
 And to the unwise she said:
 "Come, eat my bread,
 And drink the wine which I have mingled for you.
 Forsake childishness, and live,
 And walk by the ways of prudence."²

² See the caricature of this in verses 13-18, which might be entitled "The Board of Folly." In verse 18 read "spectres" instead of "giants."

Our Lord in the Gospel compares the kingdom of heaven to a feast, to which all are invited. In the foregoing passage Wisdom is represented as having built a magnificent banqueting hall and prepared a feast. The meats and the spiced wines are the teachings of Wisdom. The maids are the prophets, apostles and preachers whom God at different times has sent to invite men to practise virtue; and their message is delivered from the housetops, for it is addressed to all. Not all, however, give ear. Simple, childlike people listen, and are persuaded.

This extract calls to mind the ninth chapter of the Autobiography of St. Teresa of Lisieux. She wanted to be a saint, but felt so small when she compared herself to the saints that it was like comparing a grain of sand to a mountain. That did not discourage her. Her desires, coming from God, must be attainable. Yet, the idea of growing up was impossible. She would remain little and weak always. But she would find a quite new little way, short and direct to heaven. She would discover an elevator to raise her up to Jesus, as she felt too small to climb the steep ladder of perfection. "Then I went to the Holy Bible to find this elevator, which I desired; and I read these words pronounced by the very mouth of eternal Wisdom: 'If anyone is quite little, let him come to me.' So I drew near to God, well knowing that I had discovered what I sought; but wishing to know further what He would do to the quite little one, I continued my search and this is what I found: 'As a mother caresseth her child, so will I console you, I will carry you at my breast and will dandle you on my knees' (Is., lxvi. 13). Never before did words so tender and so musical gladden my soul. Your arms, O Jesus, are the lift which is to raise me up to heaven. For that I have no need to grow big, but on the contrary must remain and become more and more a little one. O my God, you have surpassed my expectations, and I desire to sing your mercies."

To arrange the text of Chapters x-xxii. 16 is an easy matter, for these Chapters consist of a succession of distichs without any logical sequence. Chapters xxv-xxix are much the same, except that many proverbs treating of the same subject are grouped together, and the couplet is sometimes expanded into a stanza of four or more lines.

A wise son maketh the father glad,
But a foolish son is the sorrow of his mother.

Treasures of wickedness shall profit nothing,
But justice shall deliver from death.

Hatred stirreth up strifes,
And charity covereth all sins.

In the multitude of words there shall not want sin,
But he that refraineth his lips is most wise.

The remaining parts of the Book containing the "Sayings of the Wise" (Chapters xxii. 17-xxiv, inclusive) and the last two Chapters can be arranged without much trouble, as an attentive reading of the text will show in each case where the sense ends and a new subject begins.

TRANSITORINESS OF RICHES

Labor not to be rich,
But set bounds to thy prudence.
Lift not up thy eyes to riches which thou canst not have;
Because they shall make themselves wings
Like those of an eagle,
And shall fly towards heaven (xxiii. 4-5).

THE DRUNKARD

Who hath woe? Whose father hath woe?
Who hath contentions? Who falls into pits?
Who hath wounds without cause? Who hath redness of eyes?
Surely they that pass their time in wine,
And study to drink off their cups.

Look not upon the wine when it is yellow,
When the color thereof shineth in the glass.
It goeth in pleasantly,
But in the end it will bite like a snake,
And will spread abroad poison like a basilisk.

Thy eyes shall behold strange women,
And thy heart shall utter perverse things.
And thou shalt be as one sleeping in the midst of the sea,
And as a pilot fast asleep when the stern is lost.
And thou shalt say:

"They have beaten me, but I was not sensible of pain ;

"They drew me, and I felt not.

"When shall I awake, and find wine again?" (xxiii. 29-35).

With a little patience and perseverance the whole Book of Proverbs may be copied out in this way, and the gain will be immense. The personal labor required will beget in us a familiarity with the Sacred Text, and then a love for it. If the work is done in such a way that mere scholarship and erudition for their own sake are disregarded; if we so occupy ourselves with the Sacred Scriptures, that on six days of the week we devoutly read them and meditate on their teaching and on one day of the week study them, as was the rule of Blessed Peter Julian Eymard; if we make the fifth chapter of the First Book of the *Imitation of Christ* the model of our dispositions in reading the Scriptures—then our hearts will gradually become attuned to the word of God. The Holy Spirit, who speaks by the Scriptures, will produce a divine harmony in our souls, and, when we preach, it will be the echo of that harmony which will charm the ears of our hearers, and persuade them to obey our words.

WHO MAY TEACH THE CHILD?

By PAUL E. CAMPBELL, A.M., LITT.D., LL.D.

The Catholic philosophy of education has ever taught that the parent is the first educator of the child. The close relationship of parent with child, established by the Creator, is itself suggestive of the right and the obligation of educating the child. But the place of the parent in this important work has not received clear recognition in every period of the world's history. Many nations that were appreciative of the importance of family life as the basis and the support of the State nevertheless professed ideals that led them away from a clear perception of this right and obligation of the parent. Ancient Sparta, for instance, with its socialistic and utilitarian system of education designed solely for the benefit of the State and not for the individual, regarded the family merely as the source of supply of soldiers and of future mothers of yet more soldiers.

But in no nation of modern times or of antiquity did the perception of this essential relationship of a rational parent to a rational child entirely disappear. A modern writer on education has compared educational responsibility to a pendulum that has swung at times in the direction of the parent as the chief responsible agent and at times in the opposite direction. It is possible to exaggerate the part of the parent in this work, but commonly the exponents of education have erred by trying to eliminate the parent. The same writer sees today evidences of a return to a sane perception and acknowledgment of the right and obligation of the parent.

The parent is not a law unto himself. An excess of this nature was common in the early history of enlightened Rome, which gave to the father the right of life and death over his own child. Christianity found infanticide a prevailing practice, and fearlessly denounced the exposure of infants as simple murder. The right of life and death over the child was patently an excess of parental power. Usually we find the opposite extreme: the authority of the parent is minimized to the vanishing point. On one pretext or another the modern school takes over function after function that properly belongs to the home. Parents are often only too eager

to cede their rights and thereby attempt to escape their obligations. If the child is not properly educated in accord with the circumstances in which he lives, the parent is primarily responsible. The parent must provide for religious and moral training, for physical and mental development. If the agency he selects to help in this work fails to achieve results, the parent must seek help elsewhere, must commit the task to some competent auxiliary, or himself perform it. It behooves the Christian parent and the Christian teacher, amid the distraction of present-day practice, to re-sensitize himself periodically to the fundamental principles of the Catholic position regarding American education. These principles are clearly stated in *The Catholic Year Book* of 1928:

“By the very nature of the physical and spiritual relationship between parent and child—therefore in virtue of the natural law—the parent has the duty to educate his child and the right to control the course of his education.

“By the very nature of her divine constitution, the Church has the right and the duty to teach the faith and to be the guardian and the guide of the parent in the matter of his child’s religious and moral training.

“By virtue of its very purpose as civil society, the State has the right and the duty to demand, within proper limits, that children be so instructed as to be susceptible of sound citizenship.

“It follows, therefore, that in exercising freedom in the control of the education of their children, parents are subject at once to the divine authority of the Church and to the reasonable requirements of the State.”

The Church was ever conscious of her teaching office. The history of Apostolic times gives ample testimony of this. In the beginning moral and religious teaching naturally engaged her attention. In the early days of the Church moral and religious instruction overshadowed the intellectual element which we associate with learning. “It was only when the discipline of the home waned,” writes Doctor McCormick, “and the domestic circle became incapable of supplying the moral training deemed necessary for the young, that the Church undertook to provide the whole elementary education of youth.”

Neither the Church nor the Catholic parent calls into question for one moment the right of the State to demand that all receive a

minimum education, to prescribe subjects of study that are necessary for good citizenship, to insist that teachers be of good character and professional competence, to supervise all schools as regards minimum instruction, sanitation and patriotism. But the State's concern in education is not absolutely primary but mainly secondary; its action is not monopolistic but supplementary (Lischka). The State may make such demands as are necessary to guard its own safety, to maintain a just social order, and to insure the essential public welfare.

The giving of the minimum education rightfully demanded by the State is primarily the parent's concern. Canon 1113 makes clear the mandate of the natural law: "Parents are bound by a most grave obligation to provide to the best of their ability for the religious and moral as well as for the physical and civil education of their children, and for their temporal well-being." Various decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States have from time to time insisted upon the primary right of the parent in the education of his child. These decisions have interpreted the Fifth Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States as safeguarding this right. We quote the high lights of some outstanding decisions from the summary of Doctor Lischka. On June 4, 1923, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in the case of *Meyer v. Nebraska* in which Mr. Justice McReynolds declared: "Corresponding to the right of control, it is the natural duty of the parent to give his children education suitable to their station in life."

More interesting is the famous Oregon case. In November, 1922, the people of Oregon passed a law requiring all parents and guardians to send their children between the ages of 8 and 16 to the public schools during the regular school term. The law was to become effective in September, 1926. Its purpose was to abolish all private and parochial grade schools, and thus to make elementary education a state monopoly. The District Court of the United States declared the law unconstitutional and issued an interlocutory injunction. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. On June 1, 1925, the Supreme Court decided that the law was an unreasonable interference with the liberty of parents to control the education of their children, and, through the unconstitutional compulsion exercised upon parents, a violation of the

business and property rights of corporations owning and conducting schools. Referring to the previous decision in *Meyer v. Nebraska*, Mr. Justice McReynolds declared that the Oregon Act of 1922 unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control. "The child is not the mere creature of the State," writes the Justice, "those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with the high duty to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

The Hawaii School Case brought forth another confirmation of the same principle. In February, 1927, the Supreme Court of the United States condemned an act entitled, "An act relating to foreign language schools and teachers thereof." The Act professed to regulate foreign language schools in Hawaii, but the Supreme Court declared that it would deprive parents of fair opportunity to procure for their children instruction which they think is important and we cannot say is harmful.

In the Colorado Bible Case the Supreme Court of Colorado denied the power of a Board of Education to compel the attendance of a group of Catholic children, who were pupils of the public schools, during the reading of the King James Bible as part of the curriculum. The decision enunciated the following principles: the general control of children's education is in the hands of parents; the right of parents to have their children taught where, when, how, what, and by whom they may judge best, is among the liberties guaranteed by Section I of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U. S. Constitution.

The history of the world and of education shows us conclusively that the family is ever the center of human life. Family relations are fundamental; other relations follow upon and spring from them. The love, truth and obedience that should reign in the family circle are the pattern of the highest ethical code. The inspired writer apotheosizes the contact between a father and children and illustrates by that human contact the relationship between God and man. This method of the Holy Scripture follows the best psychology by relating great truths to intimate experience.

In the bosom of the family, man has learned the great social truths which influence his action in all circumstances. The family

taught the lessons of coöperation and helpfulness to primitive man. With the development of the tribe, man thus trained sought the tribal common good. The community, the modern city and the modern nation were merely additional steps in the process of social development. Man derives in great measure his ethical, social, political and business ideals from the family. The family continues to function in the preservation of normal relations between men and women, in the generation of children, and in providing the care that is necessary for the human child.

This last-named function of the human family becomes increasingly difficult. In the field of secular knowledge the primitive mother could teach her child everything he needed to know: to protect himself from wild beasts, to find food, to keep warm—in a word, self-preservation. But the problem today is more and more complicated. Even the milk used for the baby comes from the farm many miles away. The circumstances of the family are sometimes determined in great part by prevailing rental rates. The relation of the individual to his community depends upon a number of circumstances beyond his control. This is only another way of saying that civilization becomes increasingly complex. The family retains and must retain its importance, but its functions change. No one knows better than the modern parent that the family is no longer the stable institution of a few generations ago. The Holy Father himself recently referred to a growing contempt for authority as one of the great evils of modern life. This impatience of lawful restraint is sometimes mistakenly termed by ultra-modern youth an increasing recognition of personal rights.

In the field of education we find that more information is necessary for the proper performance of any important work. This is an age of specialization. We marvel at the picture of Aristotle at seventeen years of age dwelling among philosophers and taking part in their discussions. Galileo at twenty-seven lectured in the University of Padua. Herbert Spencer with little education wrote works on education that are today standard. In any of these fields of philosophy, science, education, years of professional study are today necessary. As a result family life is postponed. Where it is not postponed, we find that the average of education is not above the sixth grade. The modern parent of this average class is not

able to give his child or children the education that modern conditions demand. The problem is complicated by the economic plane in which we live today. Frequently the father and the mother are both wage-earners, and have neither time nor ability for the education of their children. Naturally a greater burden is thrown on the school. The school supplements and extends—sometimes even supplants—the educational function of the home. The school has larger facilities and properly trained teachers. It can accomplish in a more effectual way the task of education for which the parent, as a rule, has neither the time, the means nor the requisite qualifications. But the right and the duty of the parent in the education of his children remain intact. He may perforce delegate certain functions to the school, but the school should not, through any of its ministrations, lead the parent to believe that, having placed his children in school, he is freed from responsibility.

The complexity of life makes the problem more difficult from the standpoint of the child. Modern research is concerned with the elimination of the fatigue element and with the problem of vocational adjustment. We seek to make provision for greater opportunity for play and to eliminate the excess noises so common in city streets. The specialist must take care of the problem of vocational adjustment. There are today thousands of occupations for all of which special preparation is required. Hitherto there has not been any standard system of admission. The entrance of the average man into a given occupation has been often an accidental procedure, the result of chance. Under these circumstances life has become a matter of merely making a living.

Modern life has given a new task to education—a task beyond the capacity of the parent. The school must guide the growth of the child, must adjust him to his environment. The subject-matter must be made a tool to meet life's situations. The realization of the seven objectives of education determined by the National Committee on Secondary Education will contribute to a solution of the problem. The modern curriculum must meet the challenge by making students mentally and physically sound, by preparing them for worthy home membership, by giving them an appreciation and a command of the tools and the techniques of learning, by making them aspire to lofty citizenship, by guiding them to vocational and economic

effectiveness, by training them to the wise use of leisure, and by directing all to the development of character.

But amid all this the school is merely helping the home to make children realize their responsibilities. The trained teacher in the well-equipped school is nothing more than an ally of the parent. We have spoken of the writer who compared recent trends in education to the swinging of a pendulum. In the past few generations this pendulum of interest and activity has swung away from the home towards the school, but must now return in the direction of the home. Modern education is a coöperative enterprise. The help of teachers who are specialists in their work is necessary. But the home cannot cede the right or the responsibility which rightfully belongs to it. With every help that the school can give, the major responsibility still rests with the home. Of the twenty-four hours of the day, seventeen or eighteen are spent outside the school under the control of the home. The school may have a program of adjustment and character-building, but it cannot be effectively administered without the home.

Various welfare organizations,—parent-teacher associations and similar groups—are attempting to bring back the family and the home as vital factors in the educational process. Their active and constructive participation in the work of the school gives courage to the educator. There are four definite contributions that the parent, with or without the agency of an organization, can make to the work of the school. First, the parent should preserve and promote the mental and physical health of the pre-school child. There can be no sound mind except in a sound body. Mental health is just as important as physical health, if not more so. Many parents who are solicitous for physical health give no recognition to circumstances that promote mental health. It is in this field particularly that special instruction is necessary for parents. In the second place, the home or the parent should impart certain basic life truths which can be made the foundation of the truth and information that the school imparts. Moral principles and moral practice must be ingrained by the home, or the school faces a hopeless task.

Thirdly, the parent can create in the child a proper attitude towards the school. Elders by imprudent criticism of the school in the presence of children frequently generate in the mind of the

child a hostile attitude towards the school and school work. What perverse demon inspires bachelor uncles and maiden aunts to paint the school to the pre-school nephew or niece as a chamber of horrors and tortures? Finally, from the very moment of the birth of the child—some authorities say even before birth—the parent bears in regard to the education of his child a responsibility which cannot be delegated to any other agency. The work of the school is prepared for in the home, and must be constantly supplemented by the instruction given in the home, or else the harmonious mental, moral and physical development of the child is an impossibility. There are tasks which the home simply cannot delegate. The strength and idealism which youth requires as it faces the temptations of life can be supplied only by fathers and mothers in whom strength and wisdom reside.

Parents, banded together in parent-teacher associations or like organizations, can and may assume other tasks of a social nature. They can well exert themselves in the promotion of child-welfare and home betterment. They may seek the passage of laws for the protection of women and children and the development of a public consciousness of the social responsibility that a community has in the education of the community's children. The child is a member, not only of the family, but also of the larger social group. His education must prepare him to fulfill his obligations to society. The school thus becomes an agency for social welfare, and as such it bears responsibility to the whole civic body (Pastoral Letter, 1919).

Perhaps not the least service of parent organizations might be the training of prospective parents in the rearing of children. The contract of marriage, even the Sacrament of Matrimony, does not make the parties or the recipients capable of performing the high functions that they take upon themselves. Most behavior problems, says Doctor Blanton, are due to unwise training in the home. Mother-love needs intelligence to guide its care, adds Doctor Kilpatrick. Child life is too sacred to be spoiled through parental blundering. The education of the child in the home is more fundamental than that which takes place in the school. The school cannot instill in the children respect for authority and for the property of others, qualities of leadership and coöperation, and a love for racial traditions and heritages, if these be not also instilled within the home.

CATHOLIC BROADCASTING IN BRITAIN

By J. I. LANE

Broadcasting in Great Britain has always been a monopoly. In the beginning, from 1922, it was controlled by the British Broadcasting Company; in 1926 it was taken over by the British Broadcasting Corporation, an organization popularly looked on as a government department, but in reality a self-governing body operating under a royal charter and license.¹ The Postmaster-General is responsible to Parliament for the B. B. C.'s observance of the limits imposed by the charter and license, but he does not direct the activities of the Corporation. He does, however, finance it. That is to say, backed by law, he collects in the form of an annual license the sum of ten shillings from every owner of a wireless set which is in use, and pays to the B. B. C. about seven-tenths of the total received. Thus for the year ended December 31, 1928, the income to the B. B. C. from this source was £871,763 (approximately \$4,200,000). This was supplemented to the tune of £120,635 from the second source of revenue, the profit on publications. This income was undoubtedly greater in subsequent years.

In proportion to the total population the number of listeners is very high, and is increasing. We quote from the official "B. B. C. Year Book" (1930), p. 54: "There was a steady expansion of the licensed listening public during the year. Post Office returns show that the number of licenses in force increased from 2,528,919 on August 31st 1928, to 2,760,878 on May 31st, 1929. It is estimated that at least twenty million people in the United Kingdom listen to broadcasting regularly or occasionally. It is also estimated that in this country more than one house in three contains wireless receiving apparatus. The corresponding ratio in the United States of America is one in five." At the time of writing the number of license-holders exceeds three millions.

From all this follow important conclusions. Since broadcasting is a monopoly and is adequately financed, we might on the one hand fear that the absence of competition would lead to deterioration, and

¹ The change-over involved no alteration of staff or policy. Both organizations have always been known popularly as "The B.B.C.," a title we shall use throughout.

on the other we might hope that the vast power possessed by the Directors would be used to develop the new medium to its highest point—that is to say, to give of the very best and with an accurate balance in the realms of news, education, and amusement.

It must be conceded that from the inception high ideals were aimed at. A very considerable amount of program-space has always been allotted to "Talks" on, for example, history, the drama, social questions, music, literature, science, languages, and more recently politics. In fact, the amount of instruction poured out of loud speakers would provide many an elementary, secondary, and almost university course of education!

From the beginning, too, religion has played a prominent part. The B. B. C. could have argued that, as a man's religion is his own affair, it were better to leave it alone. It took, however, the other line that, as religion was a main factor in the life of a nation, it devolved on the B. B. C. to give it publicity, to make it part of its studied policy. The practice of this high ideal was to prove much more difficult than its conception, as we shall see. Suffice it to say here that religious broadcasts took a more and more prominent place in the *daily* syllabuses until they formed approximately five per cent of the total transmissions from the chief stations. During 1929, to illustrate the development, a kind of elaborate night-prayers, called an "Epilogue," was introduced as a rounding off of Sunday's staid program. The British public would go to bed piously as far as the B. B. C. could effect it! During December it was announced that the week-day morning service, broadcast from the two principal stations, would henceforth be relayed from all stations. Morning prayers added to night prayers! There are also now noon and afternoon services.

In tackling the religious problem the B. B. C. had no enviable task. The Corporation was supported by the contributions of all sections of the community, and all sections would expect to have a share of their favorite brand of religion. But Heinz's 57 Varieties are a uniform concoction in comparison with the hundreds of sect-varieties in Britain! The B. B. C., we may judge from experience, decided to act on certain principles: first, that Britain was Christian and, therefore, that what we may term "fancy religions" could be cut out. Thus, Spiritualists and Christian Scientists did not get ■

hearing. Secondly, that, as the Church of England was the State Church, it should have preference. Hence we see that all the daily services are Anglican. Thirdly, that the chief Nonconformist organizations should be recognized—the Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, etc. And fourthly, a very important point, that the Catholic Church should have its share.

The invitation to the Catholic Church was no half-hearted one. In England the Catholics number, it is true, only one-tenth of the population; but they have more communicants than the State Church, they have prominent leaders, and they are recognized as a powerful force in the land.

In May, 1923, a Central Religious Advisory Committee was formed in connection with the London Station, and thereafter similar committees were started in the provinces as each new broadcasting center was opened. Representatives of the Anglicans, Nonconformists, and the Catholics were invited to meet periodically to discuss the fair distribution of services, choice of speakers, type of service, and any other relevant point.

So far, so good. But there was rough country ahead. Owing to the existence of a ban on controversial speeches by radio, preachers were to be limited to those subjects which were held in common by all Christian denominations; and to ensure the absence of controversial statements manuscripts of religious addresses were, as in the case of secular papers, to be submitted in advance to the B. B. C.

As a result, some of the diocesan authorities would have nothing to do with the new method of diffusing religion; one or two decided to try it for a time. The present writer found himself in 1924 appointed the representative of the Archdiocese of Liverpool on the committee attached to the Liverpool Station. His fellow-members were a representative of the Anglican cathedral, a representative of the Anglican parish clergy, and the Secretary of the local Free Church Council. His instructions from his archbishop were to limit the speakers to a carefully chosen panel, to be responsible for the first-class quality of the sermons, and to see that they were passed in advance by a theological censor.

The committee functioned amicably. The B. B. C. officials were perfectly courteous and sympathetic. Over a long period Catholic sermons were preached on an average once a month—at first from

the Radio Studio and later from St. Anne's Benedictine Church, Edge Hill, which was permanently wired by the B. B. C. for the purpose. In spite of the restrictions, a very definite course of dogmatic addresses was given, starting with the existence and nature of God, and continuing through the Fall, Sin, the Divinity of Christ, the Redemption, the Church, Grace, the Sacraments and the Future Life. Even an address on Lourdes was given in order to bring Our Blessed Lady into the schema.

It cannot be said that all this was done easily and completely satisfactorily. Preachers had to be constantly on their guard. Their expositions were necessarily cramped. The censorship, too, worked in a peculiar and irksome fashion. Objection was taken to words and phrases such as Holy Viaticum and Extreme Unction; one could speak of "the Church of God," and yet not, normally, of "the Catholic Church"; anything which seemed to belittle the magic word "science" was frowned on; always there was the atmosphere, felt by both sides, of the incongruity of a theological document being scrutinized by a layman, and a non-Catholic at that. At times matters approached a deadlock, notably when a manuscript by a leading dignitary of the Church was blue-pencilled. The situation was temporarily saved by the author becoming unexpectedly ill and so being unable to broadcast. But one felt that a crisis could not be far off.

In the meantime how did non-Catholics react to the Catholic services? Extraordinarily well. After each broadcast letters were received expressing, on the whole, keen appreciation. Catholic listeners seemed divided. Many, as far as one could gather, welcomed the evenings when a Catholic priest was announced as speaking; but the attraction was probably the eminence of the speaker and not the service in itself. For instance, it is certain that broadcasting has had little or no adverse effect on the attendances at evening service in the parish churches, though in this connection it must be remembered that practically all broadcast services have been kept to the period *after* regular church hours. Other Catholics, including on the whole the clergy, were hostile throughout. They did not think it right for Catholic priests to be preaching on the same footing as heretical ministers; they did not like the restrictions on subject-matter; they thought the censorship undignified; and they considered the form of service adopted—prayers, bible-reading, address, hymns,

and final blessing—to savor too much of Protestantism and so be calculated to give a false idea to listeners.

These objections were well known to those in charge of broadcasting, and not infrequently the idea of withdrawing from the scheme was mooted. But in view of the undoubted fact that non-Catholics were certainly being reached (as their letters and as inquiry showed), and in view of the agitation which was going on in other directions, notably in politics, for a removal of the ban on controversy, it was decided to persevere.

In early 1928 a warning of a serious nature was sounded in a quite unexpected quarter. In one of the national papers, the *Sunday Express*, the editor, Mr. James Douglas, wrote on the subject of religious broadcasting, and pointed out that the B. B. C. was introducing into Great Britain a *new religion* of which the Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard was the first bishop. To understand the full force of this remark, it must be pointed out that the reverend gentleman named, a clergyman of the Church of England, was probably the most popular broadcasting cleric in the country. His services were given a standing monthly place in the B. B. C. program—a privilege not granted to any other preacher, and, moreover, were simultaneously broadcast from all stations. His church, St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London, might aptly have been called the B. B. C.'s cathedral. Mr. Sheppard's religious ideas were anything but dogmatic; they could be summed up as a hail-fellow-well-met code of jolly humanitarian-cum-ethical dicta sprinkled with the terminology of Christianity. The prominence given to his services lent color to the argument that his type of religion was the one approved by those controlling the B. B. C., and the inference was supported by passages such as the following taken from *Broadcast Over Britain* (p. 194), a book written by the Educational Director (now the Director General) of the B. B. C., Sir John Reith: "The Christianity which is broadcast is unassociated with any particular creed or denomination. It is such that all except the hypercritical or the extreme may hear not only without offence, but with approval and profit. It is a thorough-going, optimistic and manly religion."

If the control of religious addresses was to be successfully kept within these limits, obviously, as the B. B. C. had a monopoly, a

new denomination was in process of formation, a denomination in which the ministers would be at the same time ministers of other and disagreeing denominations!

In any case, there was this much in Mr. Douglas's assertion: unless the existing arrangement were altered, the public would gradually be led to believe that the various preachers were all much of a muchness, and that their churches, like their spokesmen, were vague, helpless, and occasionally, as we would say, modernistic. This opinion was freely expressed by Catholics about the non-Catholic speakers, whose discourses were nearly always platitudinous moralizings, uplift talks, fellowship of man ferverinos, *et hoc genus omne*. The Catholic preachers, it is true, did not merit this description, though one or two sermons—perhaps better described as “talks”—were not free from taint. Still the danger was there.

The situation was radically changed when in February, 1928, the ban on political controversy was lifted. This was a distinct move forward in broadcasting. But in the religious field the Central Religious Advisory Committee recommended the continuance of the existing system. This recommendation was resisted by the Catholic representatives in certain areas. The argument chiefly relied upon was that the Catholic Church stood or fell by its claim to be the one infallible teacher placed in the world by Almighty God, and that, though it did not want freedom to attack people conscientiously differing from it, it could not allow itself to be considered one of a number of equal sects teaching a sort of lowest common multiple of Christianity. It was pointed out, moreover, that the B. B. C.'s ideal of a non-controversial Christianity was incapable of realization. In the present divided state of the country *any* religious utterance was bound to raise criticism in some quarter, and the hard fact should be recognized. The arguments held good, so that for at all events the Northern Regional Area of England (for which alone I am qualified to speak) an arrangement satisfactory to the diocesan authorities concerned was reached. This was in April, 1929, and by it the censorship of services broadcast from Catholic churches was abolished, a guarantee by the local Ordinary or his representative that “the service and address would not contain anything likely to be offensive to listeners belonging to other Christian denominations” sufficing. Addresses delivered from the Corporation's studios

would continue to be subject to censorship, but only from the point of view of "manner and not matter." Another main area in England has, I am assured, obtained the same concession; and the remaining divisions can surely have it if they so desire. Hence we may say that the charter of freedom has been won.

Its value was soon put to a strong test. In July, 1929, the present writer delivered the first address under the new agreement. The title was deliberately daring—"Authority in Religious Thought." The manuscript was not censored. It contained nothing "offensive"—that is, insulting—to non-Catholics; but it was an uncompromising statement of the Church's teaching.

The reaction was most interesting. Catholics were delighted, their particular point being that here was something definitely recognizable as Catholic. Non-Catholics were divided, as one would expect. A Baptist minister hotly protested to the B. B. C. The address, he wrote, "was a skilfully guarded but, nevertheless, thoroughgoing appeal for a Roman Catholic interpretation of Christianity . . . I should be ashamed of any of my fellow-denominationalists who used his opportunity of access to the ether for such purely denominational propaganda." It is important to note that the B. B. C. expressly dissociated itself from this criticism. On the other hand, many non-Catholics wrote sincere letters of appreciation, one listener asking for the loan of the manuscript for further study. Still others wrote, disagreeing with the teaching, but not objecting to its being put forth. We may say, then, that the results achieved were good. The Church was shown as an authoritative body with something definite to say, and thought was stimulated.

The future of Catholic religious broadcasting in Britain should be a successful one. True, there are some clergy, luckily very few, who maintain that the average listener has so far lost all ideas of religion that he will not tolerate anything but the simplest talks on general ethics. In my view this idea is utterly false; and in any case, as we have seen, is bound up in grave dangers, especially if such talks be made part of a religious service. The radio is a powerful medium for the conveyance of definite Catholic teaching to the masses, and in the reorganization of broadcasting centers now in progress it is to be hoped that all our dioceses will feel able to play an active part.

PROCEDURAL LAW OF THE CODE

By STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Extinguishment of Right of Action

In civil cases both real and personal actions are extinguished by prescription according to the rules of Canons 1508-1512; actions, however, which deal with the state of persons (*e.g.*, validity of religious profession, of Sacred Orders, or Marriage) never become extinguished (Canon 1701).

The loss of the right of action in civil cases both real and personal is governed by the laws on prescription. The prescription in Canon Law is, with a few exceptions, regulated by the laws of the respective country, the Canon Law adopting and making her own the civil laws on that matter. The goods and rights in which the Canon Law does not admit prescription are enumerated in Canon 1509, namely: (1) those of divine law, natural or positive; (2) those which can be obtained only by Apostolic privilege; (3) those spiritual rights which lay persons are incapable of acquiring, if there is question of prescription in favor of lay persons; (4) the certain and undisputed boundary lines of ecclesiastical provinces, dioceses, parishes, vicariates and prefectures Apostolic, abbeys and prelatures *nullius*; (5) stipends and obligations of Masses; (6) ecclesiastical benefices without title; (7) the right of visitation and obedience, if this would entail that subjects cannot be visited by any prelate and are no longer subject to any prelate; (8) payment of the *cathedraticum*.

Another exception is stated in Canon 1510, namely, that private individuals cannot make use of the right of prescription in the case of sacred things that may not be in the possession of private individuals.

Furthermore, in the case of immovable property, precious movable goods, and rights and personal and real claims of the Holy See only a prescription of one hundred years' duration is recognized in Canon Law (Canon 1511). Goods and rights belonging to other legal ecclesiastical persons can be acquired by prescription of thirty years (Canon 1511).

Finally, in Canon Law no prescription is valid unless it is based on good faith, not only at the moment of entering into possession but during the whole time required for prescription (Canon 1512).

In reference to acquisition of real estate by prescription in the civil law the various States have their own special rules. There is much divergence as to the number of years required, but the civil law on the length of time is not recognized in Canon Law, for, as is stated in Canon 1511, thirty years of adverse possession are required for all kinds of ecclesiastical goods and property. Ecclesiastical goods are those which belong to a legal ecclesiastical person, not the private goods of ecclesiastics. Outside the rule on the time required, the other regulations of the civil law apply, saving always and in all prescriptions the rule of Canon Law which demands good faith. Concerning the general rules on prescription against real property, Burdick (*"Real Property,"* p. 631) says: "The cases from the various States all agree that, in order to perfect title by adverse possession, the possession must be actual, for a part of the land at least; that it must be visible or notorious; that it must be hostile or adverse; that it must be exclusive; that it must be continued for the whole period required to bar action for recovery under the statute of limitations. In some States it is also necessary, by statute, that the adverse possessor should hold under color of title, and some statutes require that he must pay taxes during the running of the statute of limitations. Some States also hold that title by adverse possession cannot be acquired unless the occupant enters and holds possession in good faith."

In reference to personal property and rights of ecclesiastical persons (corporations) the time required is thirty years, and in the civil law the period of time is considerably shorter, so that the civil law is of no practical value in prescription against ecclesiastical personal property and rights. There is no prescription of personal property and rights in the United States in the sense of the Roman and the Canon Law. The latter recognize a prescription that transfers title to personal rights and property under certain conditions, the laws in the various States of the United States merely deny the right of action in court for the recovery of personal property or claims concerning the same after a length of time

specified in the laws of the State. The length of time varies with the various personal goods and contracts concerning them.

Actions in court concerning the state of persons in the Church (the married state, the clerical state, the religious state), and rights and duties proper to those states are not outlawed or barred by any kind of prescription. Concerning the married state, Canon 1973 rules that a marriage which has not been attacked while both spouses were living is presumed to have been valid, and no proof to the contrary is admitted after the death of one or both parties, unless the question of validity arises incidentally in another action in court.

PRESCRIPTION AGAINST CRIMINAL ACTIONS

Every criminal action expires with the death of the guilty person, or by condonation granted by the legitimate authority, or by the lapse of time fixed by the law for the bringing of criminal actions (Canon 1702).

Condonation as a bar to prosecution in court for an offense must come from the competent ecclesiastical authority. Private individuals may forgive the injury which they have suffered through the crime of a person, but they cannot condone the penalty of the law against him, and, even if they do not complain to the court, the officers of the law have the right and duty to prosecute the offender. The death of a person does indeed bar prosecution for his offense, but it does not completely bar the ill deeds from being considered by the courts of law, for there may be very serious consequences of his crimes for which heirs or others may have to take the responsibility. Prescription cannot be a bar to prosecution for violations of the law, unless the legislative authority grants freedom from prosecution for certain offenses after a specified length of time has elapsed since the commission of the offense. The crimes and the period of time after which freedom from prosecution is granted are enumerated in the following Canon.

Saving the precept of Canon 1555, § 1, concerning the crimes reserved to prosecution by the Holy Office, the guilty person can be prosecuted only within three years from the commission of the offense, with the following exceptions:

(1) Actions for injuries (*i.e.*, insults to one's good name and honor by word or writing or insulting act) are extinguished by the lapse of one year;

(2) Actions for qualified offenses against the sixth and seventh commandments are extinguished by the lapse of five years;

(3) Actions for simony and for homicide are extinguished by the lapse of ten years (Canon 1703).

Canon 1555 merely states that the rules of procedure outlined in the Code do not bind the Holy Office, and that this Sacred Congregation follows its own rules and customs; other Canons specify what crimes are reserved to the tribunal of the Holy Office. Canon 247 states that it judges those offenses which according to its own proper law are reserved to its tribunal, and it has authority to try those cases, not only in appeal from the court of the local Ordinary, but also in the first instance, if they have been directly carried to the court of the Holy Office. The crimes of heresy, solicitation, and absolution of one's accomplice in sins of impurity are reserved to the Holy Office.

Qualified offenses against the sixth and seventh commandments are barred from prosecution after the lapse of five years. It is important to know what a *qualified* offense against the two commandments is, for other offenses against the two commandments would be barred from prosecution after three years, as stated above. The Code itself does not explain the term, and the canonists who have tried to explain the meaning of "qualified crimes" do not agree. Some say that it means sins against purity and sins of theft to which through circumstances an additional guilt attaches besides the sin of impurity or injustice; others are of the opinion that the offenses enumerated in Canons 2357, 2359, § 2, and 2354 are meant. The term "qualified" seems to indicate that some other sin is committed in the same act against the sixth or seventh commandment.

The periods of time—one year, three, five, ten years—are called *tempus utile ad accusandum* in Canon 1703. According to Canon 1934, the accusation of an offender is reserved to the diocesan prosecutor. The period by which an offense is barred from prosecution does not run against the right and duty of the prosecutor to start proceedings against the offender if he was ignorant of the

offense or could not within that time act against the offender (cfr. Canon 35 on the meaning of *tempus utile*). The period of time which bars prosecution begins to run from the day on which the offense was committed. If it is a continued criminal act or life, the time does not run against prosecution until after the cessation of the criminal life, and the offender may be accused of and punished for connected offenses, though some of them, if considered as individual acts, would have been barred from prosecution by the lapse of time. However, those offenses which are disconnected with the offense of which a man is accused by the prosecutor are barred if the period of time specified in Canon 1703 has run against it, and the prosecutor fails to prove his right to prosecute under the term of *tempus utile*.

EFFECT OF THE BARRING OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION

If the criminal action against a person is barred by the lapse of time, the following measures may be employed against the offender:

(1) the civil action for the recovery of damages which may have been caused by the offense is not barred, unless the period of prescription has run also against the civil action;

(2) the Ordinary can make use of the remedies spoken of in Canon 2222, § 2 (Canon 1704).

The civil action which is said not to be barred by the prescription of criminal prosecution may be instituted against an offender by private individuals or corporations, not by the public authority represented by the diocesan prosecutor. If there is question of damages to ecclesiastical goods and property (*e.g.*, a pastor or other priest who criminally diverted a considerable amount of church property), the prescription against the civil action to recover damages is accomplished only after the lapse of thirty years; the parish or other ecclesiastical corporation can, therefore, sue for damages before thirty years have passed since the infliction of the damage.

The right given to the Ordinary when prescription has barred criminal prosecution is according to Canon 2222, § 2, as follows: from the past crimes of a cleric who has not yet been ordained priest he may judge that he is unfit for further Orders; for the

sake of avoiding scandal, he may, moreover, forbid a cleric the exercise of the sacred ministry, and even go so far as to remove him from the office he holds, instituting legal procedure of removal. These things do not have the nature of penalties, but are done to safeguard the dignity of the ecclesiastical ministry.

The question arises whether prescription bars criminal prosecution for those offenses for which the law of the Code or the diocesan statutes inflict the penalty. The penalty is inflicted by the Code and by diocesan statute either in the manner of *ferendæ sententiæ* or *latæ sententiæ*. The *ferendæ sententiæ* penalties, as the term itself indicates, are threatened rather than inflicted. Nothing happens to the offender unless the authorities take action, and if they do not start proceedings before the prosecution is barred by lapse of time, the penalty cannot be inflicted.

In the *latæ sententiæ* penalties the Code or the statute itself inflicts the penalty as soon as the offense specified in the law or statute is committed, and Canon 2232, § 1, states that the penalty automatically binds the offender in both the internal and external forum. There can be, therefore, no prescription against the *ipso facto* penalty of ecclesiastical law. Nevertheless, the law is reasonable and does not demand what is, humanly speaking, impossible or altogether too difficult. Wherefore Canon 2232, § 1, modifies the apparent harshness of the *ipso facto* penalties by stating that, before the authorities take action against the offender, he may in the external forum conduct himself as though he had not incurred the penalty if by the application of the penalty he would have to defame himself. If the offense was notorious (*i.e.*, so public and committed under such circumstances that it cannot be hidden by any artifice, nor excused from liability by any excuse admitted in law), he has to observe the penalty (*e.g.*, suspension from priestly functions, etc.), though the authorities have not taken action against him. Supposing that the offense to which an *ipso facto* penalty is attached is not notorious, so that the declaration of the penalty by the authorities is necessary before the penalty takes effect in public, will prescription bar the authorities from taking action against him? It seems reasonable to say that, if the authorities do not proceed against the offender before the time of prescription has elapsed, they cannot afterwards proceed to the

declaration of the penalty. Some canonists are of the opinion that prescription does not apply in the *latæ sententiæ* penalties. If the criminal action or procedure is said to be barred after a certain length of time has elapsed since the commission of an offense, it should be immaterial whether a *ferrendæ* or a *latæ sententiæ* or an undetermined penalty is stated in the law or statute; the thing that is barred is the criminal procedure against the offender. If a law or statute attaches no penalty at all to its violation, the authorities cannot punish him outright, but must first warn him to obey the law and threaten him in case of disobedience with a penalty. Only in exceptional cases, where the gravity of the scandal caused or the unusual gravity of the transgression of a law or statute requires it, may the Ordinary punish his subject when the law or statute has provided no penalty (cfr. Canon 2222, § 1).

RULES CONCERNING THE TIME REQUIRED FOR PRESCRIPTION IN CIVIL AND CRIMINAL ACTIONS

The prescription in civil cases runs from the moment at which the action could legitimately have been brought; in criminal cases from the moment of the perpetration of an offense.

If an offense extends or continues for some length of time, prescription begins to run only from the day on which one desisted from one's criminal course.

In habitual or continued offenses, the prescription does not begin to run until after the last act of the criminal conduct. When a person is prosecuted for some criminal act against which prescription has not yet barred the action, he is liable for the older offenses which are connected with the criminal act for which he is prosecuted, though prosecution for those older offenses taken individually would be barred by prescription (Canon 1705).

In civil cases one must consider the nature of the claim to ascertain from what date the party who claims to have a right to sue for goods or rights actually acquires the legal right to bring action. In contracts between two legal ecclesiastical persons, for instance, the contract itself may determine the time when it is to be considered broken, and the same determines the rights of the contracting parties. In any case, prescription does not run against a

legal claim except from the time that the claim could have been enforced in law.

In criminal cases, if an offense takes a certain length of time before it is completed, the period good for prescription does not begin with the commencement of the offense but with the last act that completes it. In habitual or continued offenses (*e.g.*, concubinage), prescription does not begin to run until the habit is broken or the last act of a series of ill deeds culminating some crime has been done. If prosecution is begun before the expiration of the period of prescription, the culprit may be prosecuted also for offenses against which the period of prescription has run provided those offences are connected with the crime for which he is brought to trial.

In the various articles on the procedural law of the Code we have thus far studied the laws on ecclesiastical trials in general, rules which mostly apply to all courts and all kinds of lawsuits. The main headings were: the competent court; various grades and kinds of courts and the persons composing the various tribunals; the discipline to be observed in the courts; the parties to a trial; actions and exceptions.

There remain to be discussed the details of the whole course of procedure in the individual case, from the introduction of a case by the bill of complaint to the proofs, incidental cases, publication of the process and closing of evidence, sentence, remedies against it, costs of the trial and execution of the sentence. Finally, there are some special rules for criminal trials, for matrimonial cases, for beatification and canonization causes, for the removal of pastors, for procedure against clerics violating the law of residence and against those guilty of concubinage, for procedure in suspension without previous warning. Therewith ends the Fourth Book of the Code on procedure.

LITURGICAL NOTES

By THE BENEDICTINE MONKS OF BUCKFAST ABBEY

X. St. James the Apostle, July 25

I. THE CULT OF THE APOSTLES

The feasts of the Apostles are among the oldest and most venerable of all Saints' days. St. Martin, as is well known, is the first Saint honored by the Church who was not also a martyr, for the cult of the Saints began with the homage paid to those who confessed the faith, not only with their tongue or by the practice of heroic virtue, but by the shedding of their blood. The first manifestation of this cult was the reverent care with which their bodies were treated. "Sepelierunt Stephanum viri timorati," we read of the funeral of the Protomartyr, and by the epithet *timorati* we are certainly given to understand not only that the men who carried the mangled body of Stephen to the grave were god-fearing men, but that they carried out their sad if sacred duty with a sense of the awfulness of their task. Their first funeral procession is the prototype of all those others which escorted so many of the early martyrs to their last resting place in the dim corridors of subterranean Rome. And it was surely to be expected that, if the martyr had held some important post or had been a member of the clergy or had been otherwise distinguished, his tomb would receive such ornamentation as circumstances permitted.

Now, when the catacombs in addition to being the burial places of dead Christians became also the meeting places or places of shelter for the living, Mass came to be said on the tomb of the martyrs, and many of these graves were made so as to fit them for this use. The custom of celebrating the holy sacrifice on the tomb and over the bodies of the martyrs goes back to the earliest period of Christianity, and it is obvious that the practice owes its origin to and was inspired by a famous passage in St. John's Revelation when, at the opening of the fifth seal, the prophet saw "under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice saying: 'How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and revenge our blood?'"

(Apoc., vi. 9, 10). To this day the altar must contain at least some tiny fragments of the body of a Saint or Martyr before Mass may be celebrated upon it.

It stands to reason that the Apostles should have been the very first to be honored by the Church they had watered or adorned with their blood. The bodies of Sts. Peter and Paul were certainly the object of religious veneration from the very hour of their martyrdom, and Rome has an unbroken tradition concerning the keeping and occasional translation and even the hiding of their sacred relics. We know that from the year 258 a *Statio* was held on June 29, not only at the Vatican and on the way to Ostia, but also *ad catacumbas*—a place about two miles outside Rome and on the Appian way, which served as the hiding place of the bodies of the Princes of the Apostles. Even after the sacred bodies were replaced in their original burying places, the spot on the Appian Road, where now stands the Basilica of St. Sebastian (not far from the tomb of Cecilia Metella), remained sacred in the memory of the people, so much so that in some places (for instance in Gaul or in some Eastern churches) there was danger of the date of their martyrdom being forgotten by reason of the solemnity with which the translation to the catacombs was observed or commemorated.

If the Princes of the Apostles were thus honored at Rome—the city watered with their blood and illumined by the splendor of their apostolic teaching—it was perfectly natural that other churches or countries should pay similar homage to those who lighted the lamp of faith in their midst. Hence, we must take it as certain that the cult of the Apostles began from the very hour almost of their several martyrdoms.

II. ST. JAMES THE GREATER

St. James was the elder brother of St. John. Both were sons of Zebedee, a fisherman, or we should say perhaps the owner of a small fishing fleet which plied its trade on the waters of the Sea of Galilee. Our Lord invited them to follow Him at the very outset of His public career, and at His bidding they promptly forsook everything—their father included—and attached themselves to the Master. Such were their fiery character and ardent zeal that Our Lord Himself called them “the sons of thunder.”

St. James, possibly owing to his being the brother of the disciple whom Jesus loved, enjoyed a special intimacy and familiarity with Our Lord. He is one of the three who were singled out from among the apostolic college to witness the mysterious and to them unforgettable scene enacted on a lofty mountain plateau, when something of the glory of the Godhead shone through and transfigured the human form of Christ. The counterpart of this splendid scene was the dreadful spectacle they saw soon after, again in a lonely place, on a hill, and in the silent hours of the night—for Peter, John and James went with the Lord into the garden and took their station not far from the grotto of the agony. The same three had likewise witnessed the stupendous miracle wrought by Our Lord at the beginning of His public ministry, when He recalled to life the young daughter of Jairus. One who had thus seen the Lord in splendor, in power and in pain could have no doubt as to His being indeed the very Son of God as well as a true Son of man, for only such a one could do the greatest miracles with such effortless simplicity; only around the head of God's Son could the divine splendors play as they did round Him on Thabor; and again, if Jesus had not been truly man, He could not have undergone the struggle and death of Gethsemani and Calvary.

St. Stephen is the first in that long procession of white-robed martyrs who witnessed to the truth even unto death. St. James is the protomartyr of the apostolic college. It was in the year 42 (some say 44) and about the paschal festival that Herod Agrippa "stretched forth his hands to afflict some of the Church; and he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword" (Acts, xii. 1, 2). Death by the sword was particularly odious in the eyes of the Jews: it was another sign of foreign domination. In former times, when about to carry out a capital sentence, the lictors used to undo their bundle of staves to take out their axe. At the time of St. James' martyrdom this was no longer done: executions were carried out by the sword so that by then the *fascēs* were no more than an emblem of the power of life and death. It is expressly stated that James was put to the sword. It follows that the ordinary Roman procedure was followed and none of its customary horrors were spared to the Apostle. He was, therefore, stripped, his head was covered with a

veil or sack, his hands were tied behind his back, and so he was subjected to the fiendish torture of a Roman scourging.

According to an ancient tradition, St. James, after evangelizing Judea and Samaria, set out for a missionary journey to Spain, and it was on his return from that distant province that he obtained the crown of martyrdom. Needless to say that this tradition has been strongly impugned, not only on grounds of chronology, but also on the strength of the well-known text of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, in which the Apostle announces his intention to go to Spain and to be escorted by them on his journey: "When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, I hope that, as I pass, I shall see you and be brought on my way thither by you" (Rom. xv. 24). Now, we know that it was a settled policy of the Apostle of the Nations on no account ever to encroach upon the province of another preacher of the Gospel, but always to break new ground: "I have so preached this gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation, but as it is written: They to whom he was not spoken of, shall see, and they that have not heard shall understand, for which cause also I was hindered very much from coming to you and have been kept away till now" (*ibid.*, 20-23).

Here we have a very real difficulty, though perhaps not an insuperable one, for, as a matter of fact, this law which St. Paul had made unto himself was not altogether a hard and fast one, for he certainly came to Rome and so preached where another and greater than he had founded a church. This point will probably never be cleared up, no more than the question whether St. Paul actually carried out his intention of going to Spain.

In the sixth century the tombs of two Apostles of the name of James were still being honored at Jerusalem. But in the ninth century the body of the brother of St. John was already venerated at Compostela in Galicia. However, nothing is known as to the exact time or the manner of the translation of the relics. As a matter of fact, though the question does not arise for a Spaniard, many scholars have cast a doubt upon the authenticity of the relics venerated at Santiago. But it seems indeed very hard to believe that a cult so famous as that paid to St. James at Compostela could have arisen fortuitously and have no more solid foundation than a legend, not to say a fraud.

The opponents of the Spanish tradition make much capital of a letter of Pope Innocent I (A.D. 416) in which that pontiff asserts categorically that it is manifest that "neither in Italy, Gaul, Spain . . . were any churches founded except by men sent thither by St. Peter or his successors; let them see if in those provinces any apostle is known to have resided or taught" (*aut legant si in his provinciis alius apostolorum invenitur aut legitur domisse*). At first sight this looks like a crushing argument, but the difficulty is not so insoluble as it seems. The Bollandists point out that there is no inherent opposition between the words of Innocent and the Spanish tradition, because it is perfectly possible and credible that both St. Paul and St. James went to Spain and preached there, without founding churches—that is, without their putting themselves at the head of and governing the Christian communities that sprang up as a result of their preaching (cfr. *Acta SS.*, July 25, Vol. VI, p. 97). The author of the article on St. James the Great in the "Catholic Encyclopedia" rightly observes that, as regards the authenticity of the relics, a strong argument in its favor is found in the Bull "Omnipotens Deus," of Leo XIII, of November 1, 1884.

The martyrdom of St. James took place in the springtime of the year, for it was during the days immediately preceding the Pasch that Herod sought to curry favor with the Jews—apparently with success (*videns quia placeret Judæis*). For this reason the feast was kept by the Copts in April, and it may be, says Schuster, that the feast of May 1 (Sts. Philip and James) was originally kept in honor of James, the son of Zebedee, not of James the Less, and that the feast of July 25 was the day set apart to honor the latter.

III. THE MASS OF THE FEAST

For the most part, the Mass of St. James is similar to that of the Common of the Apostles. The Introit in particular is the usual one (*Mihi autem*, etc.). But the Collect is one of the most beautiful examples of this kind of liturgical composition. It is brief, terse, and goes straight to the point. Its three short clauses are beautifully balanced, and produce that rhythmic movement which characterizes what is called *cursus planus*. The text is found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, but even a first hearing of the resonant syllables would convince anyone possessed of some knowledge of the Roman Liturgy

that in our Collect he prays in the noble accents with which the early Church addressed Almighty God. Any translation must weaken the strength of the Latin original, for we must needs use circumlocutions for the original conciseness. And here we may note the easy familiarity with which God is approached—no epithet or rhetorical precaution is used but just a simple *Domine* (Lord). And the grace asked for through apostolic intervention and protection is that we may please the Lord by our life and serve Him in peace of mind: “Be to Thy people, O Lord, a sanctifier and a protector, so that, strengthened by the help of Thy apostle James, it may please Thee by its life and serve Thee with a confident mind.”

The Gospel of the Mass is an extract from the Gospel of St. Matthew, and recalls an episode in the life of our Saint and his brother John. The incident happened at a time when their hearts still cherished ambitions of worldly greatness. One day their mother approached Our Lord to ask a favor of Him—nothing less, in fact, than that her two sons, who were by her side, should have the most privileged positions whenever Jesus would show Himself in all the majesty of the earthly kingdom that, she doubted not, He had come to found in this world. The Fathers point out that, though their mother makes the request, the answer of Jesus is addressed to the sons, for even though the mother may have been actuated by personal ambition and the natural instinct of a mother to do the best for her children, in all probability the two brothers were not strangers to the step she was taking—in fact, to put it in a homely phrase, it may well be that they “put her up” to doing it. They had heard Our Lord making magnificent promises—allocating seats of honor to the twelve and holding up before their wondering eyes the spectacle of themselves seated in judgment over the twelve tribes of their own people. How could these still untutored men help their imaginations being fired by such prospects? As St. John Chrysostom points out, the mystery of the cross was not yet accomplished: the grace of the Holy Ghost had not yet been poured into their hearts. So there was sufficient explanation, if not an adequate excuse, for their ambitious request. But so soon as they did receive the Holy Ghost, they flung far from them all thought of worldly greatness, and they certainly did drink in copious draughts of the

cup of suffering which was all that Our Lord could hold out to them. The time was soon to come when James and John, together with their fellows, "went from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus" (Acts, v. ult.).

The Secret and Postcommunion are also found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, which, in addition has a special Preface of great beauty: "Vere dignum et justum est . . . quia licet nobis semper salutem operetur divini celebratio sacramenti, propensius tamen nobis confidimus profecturam si beati Apostoli tui Jacobi intercessionibus adjuvemur."

A NEGLECTED PART OF "CASTI CONNUBII"

By FRANKLYN J. KENNEDY

In more than one diocese in our country the Encyclical on Christian Marriage was at the Ordinary's suggestion made the subject-matter of the Lenten discourses. Other bishops urged that it be read to the people at the Masses on Sunday. Hence, it is safe to say that the average priest has done his duty in teaching the doctrinal part of Matrimony during these past months.

Late in the same document we read of the remedies whereby the detestable abuses of marriage might be removed. It is of interest to note that among the remedies suggested is a rather lengthy, very capable one listed as economic. A strong plea is made for a living wage. Reference is made to the demands laid down by Pope Leo XIII, "that in the State such economic and social methods should be set up as will enable every head of a family to earn as much as, according to his station in life, is necessary for himself, his wife, and for the rearing of his children; for 'the laborer is worthy of his hire.' " Pius XI repeats the principles contained in the *Rerum Novarum*, and warns that depriving the worker of his rightful remuneration is a grave injustice and is placed among the greatest sins by Holy Writ.

Has the average priest done his duty when he has preached with fervor on the evils opposed to Matrimony and shortly referred to the remedies? The reason advanced in nine cases out of ten for the practice of birth control is an economic one. There is no need to insist on its invalidity. There is no need to say that possibly six out of the nine cases use this sophistical reasoning without there being in fact a foundation for it. A conservative estimate is that three out of ten cases are sincere and truthful in advancing this apparently sound but unmoral reason. Facts in the specific cases would prove that the married parties are oppressed by straitened circumstances. Their unsound argument is dismissed shortly and often vehemently by the confessor, and there the matter rests—as far as the priest is concerned.

Why not face facts? The Pope does not hesitate to do so: "These most pernicious errors and depraved morals have begun to spread

even amongst the faithful and are gradually gaining ground." The experience of the fourth curate at a metropolitan church coincides with that of the pastor in the village of fifteen hundred souls—and both attest to the discerning vision shown in the above quotation.

Has the priest done his duty when he has finished reading from the Encyclical: "But no reason, however grave, may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and morally good"? Has the confessor done his duty when he has answered the "we-can't-afford-to" argument by saying: "You'll have to, or I can't give you absolution"? Is there an obligation on the priest's part to apply the remedy suggested by the Pope? Is it not good moral teaching to do away with the occasion of sin? The occasion for the practice of birth control—so it is estimated—in three cases out of ten is a factual lack of money. Is it not a duty incumbent upon those who denounce the sin to put forth some effort towards the eradicating of the occasion? Is such expecting too much of the clergy?

Forty years ago Leo XIII insisted that "every minister of holy religion must bring to the struggle [of the teeming masses of the poor for a comfortable and frugal existence] the full energy of his mind and all his power of endurance." It is not said in a spirit of criticism but a mere statement of fact to remark that the clergy of forty years ago to whom the Encyclical was addressed did not heed the document. They did not show interest in it, by and large. It is a truism to state that it caused nowhere near the comment in and out of church circles that the late pronouncement on Christian Marriage caused.

And yet, why? It was Christian teaching, issued by the High Teacher of Christendom. It contained an insistence on the principle that Christian justice must pervade the relations between employer and employee. The moral obligation of employers to pay a fair wage, a living wage, was set forth. The document was the *pou sto* by which, with the lever of social justice, the moral deterioration of the world—even then evident—would be expelled from civilized society.

Many reasons could perhaps be adduced for the indifference shown to Leo's memorable Encyclical on Labor. The clergy of that day were busy building the material fabric of the Church. By sheer

determination and boundless energy, they were piling brick upon brick and stone on stone of every church and school and institution in this land. In their untiring zeal for the Church Material, perhaps they had little time to digest Leo's Encyclical. Undoubtedly, the vast majority of them did not have the keen foresightedness of the then reigning Pope. And hence the document and its doctrines were grossly neglected.

It is interesting to conjecture the result if Leo's teaching on the solution of the social and economic problem had been accepted with fervor and zeal by the clergy of that day. If it had been preached and spread broadcast as the latest Encyclical from Rome has been, perhaps the recent one on Christian Marriage would not have been needed. Leo inveighed against a materialistic, capitalistic, individualistic civilization. Our modern civilization insists that the Catholic teaching on birth control does not fit in with "modern conditions." We know that "modern conditions" are that set of circumstances imposed on the masses of the laboring poor which is little better than slavery itself. Had Leo's doctrine been given to the people, a Christian influence would have infiltrated into industry; perhaps, it might have permeated all industry with the happy result of every worker receiving a decent wage.

It is not for us to speak in criticism of the past except with the hope that we of today may do the task that was left undone. When the whole social structure of the world is beginning to quake about us, is it not a fit time for the Church—through her priests—to speak the words that will cause the sea of social unrest to be calmed? What more fitting words and principles could be presented to a world hungering after the truths of social justice than Leo's Encyclical "On Labor"? What more fitting time to begin our evangelization than during this year when the civilized world is celebrating the fortieth anniversary of its issue?¹

Would it not be heartening to many of our Catholics to hear their priests interesting themselves in the amelioration of the conditions of the poor? Forty per cent of those gainfully employed in the United States receive a wage which does not allow them a decent subsistence in normally prosperous times. Have we not a duty to

¹ This article was written before the second radio address of the Holy Father challenged again the attention of the world to Leo's superb Encyclical.

the Catholics—in fact, to all—who belong to this group? If our duty were done in insisting on social justice, the three out of ten cases of those practising birth control on account of straitened circumstances might be greatly reduced. Can we with honor preach Pius XI's condemnation of these practices without at the same time preaching this one of the remedies he suggests—a living wage? Can we do full justice to the Encyclical on Christian Marriage without presenting the principles of Leo's document "On the Condition of the Working Classes"? Will "Casti Connubii" be truly effective if it is not bulwarked with "Rerum Novarum"?

OUR READING PROBLEM

By THE REV. FATHER WALTER, O.S.B.

Do we have a reading problem among our people? Do we know what our people are reading? Some of us might be surprised and even shocked on finding out what some, and perhaps many, of our people are reading, and how they are being affected by it. We cannot steadily associate with a certain class of people without being influenced by them. And quite certainly we cannot steadily read a certain kind of literature without being more or less affected and influenced by what we read. Therefore, it is important for us priests to know what our people are reading. Is their reading sufficiently religious in quantity and quality to counteract the anti-religious influences to which they are daily exposed?

There are good reasons why religious books do not sell as extensively among our people as publishers and we should desire. These reasons have been elaborated by sundry writers in sundry publications and by many preachers in many pulpits. Seemingly all this writing and preaching has not yet resulted in a marked rise of Catholic publishing stocks. Perhaps our propaganda methods are wrong or unconvincing. What is wrong, and who is at fault? Can we do anything about it?

The people need religious books, and our publishers have a goodly number and variety for sale and are anxious to sell them. No doubt at all many more religious books—books written with the purpose of helping people to live better and happier and fuller lives—could be sold if they were advertised more effectively by writers and preachers. Non-religious books are being sold in quantities that justify large and comparatively cheap editions. They are sold by high-powered advertising. These publishers and advertisers are very much concerned about their profits and not so much about benefiting the buyers of their wares. They promise the buyer a liberal education for three cents a day and fifteen minutes of interesting reading. They promise to make him a well-informed, charming, irresistible conversationalist if he will read a certain collection of literary hash. They promise to make over his personality, to give him magnetism, to improve his style, to make him a convincing

and persuasive speaker or a great executive. They promise what appeals to the average and uncritical moron, and people believe and buy. Such dishonest advertisements of such shoddy literary goods are sometimes found even in some of our high-class Catholic periodicals! Some time ago I wrote to one of these offending journals and expressed my surprise and regret that even they had bent their knees to Baal. My remonstrance was ignored.

A few years ago a young man employed on a socialist paper conceived the idea of acquiring the republication rights of books which were dead stock on the hands of the original publishers. He established a kind of hospital-morgue, half believing and half hoping that some of these books were only apparently dead. He operated on them, cutting away much of their fat and bulk by reducing them to about fifteen thousand words in size. He also gave them new and more fascinating titles. He knew the value of clever word combinations for advertising purposes. A book with the title "Dante and Other Waning Classics" had not sold itself. The title had no general appeal. This clever book-surgeon performed a reducing operation on it, and dismissed it from his hospital with the title "What You Should Know about the Classics." It has been selling since at the rate of about 15,000 copies a year.

Ed Howe's book, "The Preaching of a Brother-in-Law of the Church," did not sell. Our self-made literary doctor reduced it to proper size, and injected life and vigor into it with the title "Success Easier than Failure." Who would not buy so promising a book? It actually sold itself in 75,000 copies the first year. Seemingly plenty of people appreciate easy success, but religion makes no appeal to them.

A book with the title, "The Art of Conversation," died on the shelves of its publisher. People probably believed that they knew all about talking or conversation that they needed or cared to know. When it was reduced to the standard form and dressed up with the title "How to Argue Logically," it began to sell 30,000 copies a year.

One of the most interesting things about this publishing venture is that a pamphlet with the title, "How to Conquer Stupidity," is selling itself to about 47,000 people a year. It would probably sell itself to many more people if they saw the promising advertisement. Proud as they may be at heart, these people must be suffering from

a hidden inferiority complex. The publisher calls his collection of booklets "The University in Print." The catalogue states: "During a little more than ten years 100,000,000 copies of these Little-Books have been sold to readers in every land on the face of the earth. The aim has been to have nothing cheap about the Little-Books except the price. The Little-Books are as perfect typographically, editorially, and mechanically as skilled efforts can make them. Fun—education—everything! No matter what your reading interests may be, you are sure to find many Little-Books that will entertain, amuse, inform, assist, and improve you." It is not likely that all these booklets are carefully read by their buyers, but they are at least bought by those who are seeking reading matter that appeals to large classes of people whose curiosity is intrigued by clever editing and by fascinating titles.

Now, is there a lesson in this for the writers and publishers of religious books? Religious books ought to be the most enticing things for the majority of reading people, at least for *our* reading people. Why are they not? One reason may be that the titles are usually not provoking or insinuating or promising enough to stimulate the interest or the curiosity of the average Catholic reader. The fact that some 10,000,000 copies of certain little books of uniform size and cost are sold in one year seems to prove that good titles and clever advertising will sell books which had died of poor titles.

Another reason why religious books do not sell in larger numbers is an unreasoning fear or prejudice of people that such reading might make them too religious. They are afraid that the religious preoccupations begotten of such reading would interfere with their temporal pursuits. This is a much more common prejudice than we might be willing to believe without supporting statistics. People want to be religiously safe or safely religious, but not too intensely so. They want to have the largest and widest possible temporal and worldly latitude: *Intra spem veniæ cauti*.

Still another reason is to be found in the many worldly and narrowly selfish interests which indispose the mind for religious reading and growth. Too many people have the false notion that religion is something cold and stern and forbidding, and largely made up of a collection of "don'ts" that block the way—every easy way—to human happiness. They do not believe that Solomon uttered wis-

dom that was born of full human experience when he wrote (*Eccles.*, i. 14): "I have seen all things that are done under the sun, and behold all is vanity and vexation of mind." They believe that all such utterances, of which there are many in the world's literature and many more from the world's common sinners, are the cries of disappointed or despairing old pessimists. They believe that Byron, who died as a young man, was soured on life when he wrote:

My days are in the yellow leaf,
The flowers and fruits of love are gone:
The worm, the canker, and the grief
Are mine alone.

It is perhaps impossible to convince men of the utter vanity of the things of time and of the poisonousness of all pleasures that are rooted in sin until they have tasted their bitterness unto despair. Religious reading is about the best antidote against the attractions that force themselves upon all of us in our temptation-ridden surroundings. Fairly common experience proves that our corrupt nature, confirmed in self-indulgence, is not of itself inclined to take up a course of religious reading without some pressure from within or from without. Left to ourselves, even though committed to a spiritual life by vow or vocational needs, we are prone to neglect religious reading. There is so much other possible reading that makes a more immediate appeal to us. And secular reading is more amusing and much less disturbing to our conscience and much less interfering with our habits of self-indulgence. Ordinarily, to make us read spiritually, we must either be set down with a spiritual book and kept under surveillance for a definite time, and perhaps even be required to give an account of our reading. Or we must determine of our own accord that we will read spiritually every day for a definite time. When we have done so for some time, after overcoming the initial disinclination to the practice, we come to profit by any spiritual book and so gradually refine and deepen our spiritual sense. Out of this will grow a taste for spiritual reading and the consciousness of our need for it. Books which at first left us cold will exert a warming power over us. Without some such course of religious reading—habitual, regular, daily spiritual reading—we are not likely to find prayer and spiritual living an ever-increasing delight.

If only we could set down everybody every day to a well-balanced ration or diet of spiritual reading! If only we would first of all be firm with ourselves and daily go through a fixed amount of spiritual reading in the right spirit! If somebody would originate a few spiritual titles and mottos trenchant enough to get under our spiritual skin! "What You Should Know about the Spiritual Classics!" "How to Conquer Spiritual Stupidity!" "It's Easier to be Happy than Miserable!" Such and similar titles might make some of us interested and inquisitive enough to read and investigate their claims. At any rate, more discriminating advertising, more convinced and persistent talking about reading, should produce some good results.

Some years ago, as I was walking along a country road,

. . . *sicut meus est mos,*

Nescio quid meditans nugarum, totus in illis (Horace, Sat., I, ix. 1)
an auto slowed up behind me and stopped as it came abreast of me. The driver asked me: "Father, would you not rather ride than walk?" As I was walking against a rough wind which was cutting my face, I accepted the offer. The man introduced himself to me saying: "I am Mr. M., and this is Mrs. M. You may not know us, but you have heard our names. We know you very well." The woman had something on her mind, and at once went *in medias res*. She turned to me and asked: "Father, what do you think of Will Durant's book?" "The Story of Philosophy" was at that time the talk and the rage, and I had not yet caught up with it, but I keenly realized at that moment that there is some practical use for a priest in keeping *au courant* with modern movements and general literature. With all her pretentious culture, however, the woman was religiously ignorant enough to believe that Will Durant could still be a practical Catholic. Subsequently I familiarized myself with "The Story of Philosophy" and with "Transition," and then wrote her a critical account of the author's religious standing. At the moment of their talking to me I did not allow these two people to quiz me too much about what I thought of what they had been reading, but took the lead in the conversation. I asked them what Catholic periodicals they were getting and reading. I began:

"Are you reading *America*?"

"Yes, we get it regularly and read it religiously."

"Are you getting *The Commonwealth*?"

"No, we don't know that at all. Never heard of it. What is it? Is it a Catholic publication?"

"Yes, it is and you ought to get it. Intelligent people like you ought to keep posted on such matters as *The Commonwealth* and other Catholic periodicals will bring to your knowledge. By all means get *The Commonwealth*. You will be delighted with it."

When we take our parish census we might conveniently and profitably inquire about the reading habits and preferences of our people. We may have our personal opinions as to what our people ought to read in the religious line, but we must all admit and desire that they should read some serious and religious books. They should keep and read the diocesan paper. They should subscribe to one or more Catholic periodicals and also read them. There is sufficient variety and choice among them to suit everyone's educational status and taste. It is not at all to the point to say that our people will not read such things. They will read what they should read if we coach them. Some of us are deplorably uninformed with regard to current Catholic literature. We read the daily papers and perhaps some secular magazines. To keep ourselves officially and religiously posted we ought to read *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, *The Ecclesiastical Review* (we ought to see both of them every month), *America*, *The Commonwealth*, *The Catholic World*, and similar publications. We ought to read the Sacred Scriptures systematically and regularly, but do we? If we are interested in the right kind of reading, we will make some active propaganda for it. A pastor can make himself to a considerable extent the master of the reading in his parish. And according to his opportunities he is responsible for it. Therefore, more and better advertising of Catholic reading among our people. Persistent and clever advertising is effective.

We have a Catholic book-shelf, but we might have more than one. We must learn from others to make books small and attractive and titles catchy. Books of information are needed and should be made a delight to eye and hand. The printer's art should be made the most of in order to make the reading easy and a help to mind and memory.

We priests must be interested. Without us no scheme in this line

will succeed. With us intelligently active in the book and reading propaganda, our people will subscribe to Catholic publications, and buy and read Catholic literature, and come to like it and to profit by it and to become better informed and more courageous Catholics. Our people are reading what the Gentiles around them read, because we have made little effort to control their reading.

We can do much in the matter of directing our people in their reading, but, if we do nothing, we cannot with justice rail against the perversity of their taste. We may make excuses. We may rationalize our inactivity. We usually do. One time a priest with whom I had been discussing this problem said to me: "You do not understand this reading difficulty. You have no experience with it. It is easy enough to say what others ought to do, but, if you had to cope with it yourself, you would have to admit that it is simply and desperately impossible to make our people read Catholic literature."

I told this good man that I had some experience, and that my contentions were just exactly based on my own experience. A priest's success in this matter is fairly commensurate with his interest and efforts. He must not content himself with telling his people: "You must read Catholic papers and religious books." He must secure their consent to ordering things for them. Or he must support a competent agent with his authority. Then he must direct their attention to articles and statements. He must arouse their curiosity and interest by his comments. This is certain, that the reading problem among our people must be handled and solved by the priesthood. Our Divine Teacher and Master called us the salt of the earth and the light of the world. We are called to season and to enlighten and to strengthen. We ought to meditate often on the functions of salt and of light, and see to what extent we are performing these extremely necessary functions. Performing these functions honestly and seriously and strenuously will keep us interested and prolong our lives and save us from ennui and deterioration.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

IMPLIED DISPENSATION FROM IMPEDIMENT OF CRIME

Question: Will you please explain what cases of *sanatio matrimonii* are covered by the general dispensation of June 3, 1912? SACERDOS.

Answer: The Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments of June 3, 1912 (*Acta Ap. Sedis*, IV, 403), speaks of cases in which a new marriage is allowed to persons who obtain from the Holy See a dispensation from *matrimonium ratum non consummatum*, and to persons who get the *testimonium libertatis* after the process concerning the presumed death of their spouse. Sometimes those persons have contracted a civil marriage before they were free to marry before the Church. By the attempt at marriage and the adultery they contract the impediment of crime. Often the petition for dispensation from the impediment of crime is forgotten in those cases, and consequently the marriage before the Church is invalid. To obviate such invalidity, the Holy See declares that, with the dispensation from the *matrimonium ratum non consummatum* and with the permission to marry again after the process concerning the presumed death of the spouse, the dispensation from the impediment of crime also, if it should be necessary, is *ipso facto* granted. As to the past, the Holy See grants a *sanatio* or automatic revalidation of marriages which in the foregoing cases were contracted invalidly for reason of the impediment of crime from adultery and mutual promise of marriage or attempted marriage.

DISPENSATION BY TELEPHONE OR TELEGRAM—SIGNING OF PROMISES IN MIXED MARRIAGES—SANATIO OF MARRIAGE OF TWO CATHOLICS

Question: Kindly answer the following questions in THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW:

(1) May dispensations be granted by telephone or telegraph in case of necessity or urgent cases?

(2) Are dispensations for marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics, baptized or unbaptized, valid and licit if the promises are signed only by the non-Catholic?

(3) May a *sanatio in radice* be granted when the parties concerned are

both Catholics, but one refuses to have the marriage validated in the ordinary way? PASTOR.

Answer: (1) Concerning the granting of dispensation by telephone or by telegram, we have the general practice of the Apostolic See that dispensations should be given in writing, and there is no doubt that the Church desires the local Ordinary to follow that practice. About marriage dispensations, Wernz-Vidal say that undoubtedly the Ordinaries are obliged to follow the rules of the Roman Curia, and must therefore give the dispensations in explicit terms and in writing. The dispensations are valid if given by telephone or telegraph, unless the Holy See in granting faculties to the Ordinaries insists on a written dispensation under pain of invalidity. In those cases in which the law states that the priest has certain faculties in urgent cases provided the local Ordinary cannot be reached, it is assumed that the priest can neither go to him in person nor reach him by letter. We do not think that the prohibition to grant a dispensation by telephone or telegram (provided the faculties of the Ordinary do not contain an invalidating clause) forbids the Ordinary to grant a dispensation in this extraordinary manner in cases of emergency. Though, as Génicot says (*Theol. Moralis*, II, n. 526), Pope Leo XIII forbade the Roman Congregations *ordinarily* to accept petitions for dispensations sent by telegram, and wished the same prohibition to apply to the bishops, the Supreme Pontiff did not intend to forbid petitions for dispensations to be accepted and granted by telephone or telegraph in case of necessity.

(2) The Code of Canon Law (cfr. Canon 1061, § 1, n. 2) demands that in marriages of Catholics to non-Catholics both parties promise the Catholic baptism and education of all the children, and it is quite plain from the text of the law that the promise is required for the validity of the dispensation. Ordinarily the promises are to be made in writing, but a sincere oral promise would be valid.

(3) As far as we know, the local Ordinaries have no faculties from the Holy See to grant a *sanatio in radice* of marriages when both parties are Catholics. The matter would have to be referred to the Holy See. Moreover, in the recent faculties granted to the bishops for *sanatio in radice* of marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics the Holy See demands a guarantee that the Catholic

woman will be permitted to practise her religion, and that the children will be baptized and educated as Catholics. It seems, therefore, that when the non-Catholic is so much opposed to the Church that practically there is no guarantee for the Catholic faith of the Catholic party and the children, the marriage cannot be validated by the *sanatio in radice*. If the Church does not permit the marriage of Catholics to non-Catholics unless the faith of the Catholic party and the children is guaranteed, it is only logical that she would not validate a marriage which was contracted outside the Church in opposition to the rules of the Church, unless the Catholic faith of the Catholic party and the children is safe. It is not merely a church law that forbids Catholics to endanger their faith and that of the children, but it is the divine law which forbids the same.

PRE-MATRIMONIAL AGREEMENT ON USE OF CONTRACEPTIVES

Question: Does a pre-matrimonial agreement to practise unlawful artificial birth control for a limited, specified time invalidate marriage?

CONFESSARIUS.

Answer: The divine law concerning the rights and duties of married persons certainly demands that nothing be done against the essential obligations of that state. Each of the contracting parties must necessarily give to the other the right to proper conjugal intercourse for the purpose for which God instituted marriage. If by agreement before marriage that right is denied, it means the denial of the very object of the marriage contract. The fact that the right to proper intercourse is not denied permanently but for a specified period of time does not alter the case, for the parties are interfering with the essential and inherent object of the marriage. Canonists and moralists who discuss this question draw attention to the fact that the sinful will or intention of the parties to abuse marriage can stand together with the predominating intention to contract marriage as willed by Christ. However, when an agreement is made by the parties which is contrary to the essentials of a Christian marriage, it is evident that they do not mean to contract a Christian marriage, but merely employ the outward form of marriage to protect their sinful relations before the public. As to the validity or invalidity of the marriage, it is immaterial whether the agreement can or cannot be proved, and in many cases nobody

will know of it except the two contracting parties. Canon Law provides for the validating of marriages for both the internal and the external forum. Before God persons who rendered their marriage invalid by their own sinful agreement must rectify the marriage if they want to be conscientious Christians. The declaration of nullity of marriages vitiated by pre-matrimonial agreements is not easy to obtain from an ecclesiastical court because of the difficulty of proving the agreement, for the parties concerned are not to be considered as witnesses in establishing the fact that the agreement contrary to the essence of marriage was made.

If there was no explicit agreement but a so-called "understanding" between the parties to have sinful intercourse for a few years so as to avoid having children in the first years of their marriage, or to have one and after that abuse marriage and frustrate its natural purpose, it is doubtful whether before God such people are married. Some moralists say that the expression of the evil intention to abuse the sacred state of marriage does not necessarily exclude the will and intention to contract a true marriage. That might be true if there was question merely of obligations attached to the married state, for then one might have the intention to get married but not to trouble oneself about the obligations; but when the object of the perverse will and intention touches the very object and essence of the married state, one cannot say that one wants the married state, at least not such as God has ordained.

CONCERNING GREGORIAN MASSES

Question: Will you please explain whether Gregorian Masses are to be said for *one* deceased person, or whether they may be said for several (*viz.*, for deceased parents, relatives, etc.).

READER.

Answer: The beginning of the custom of having Masses said on thirty consecutive days for one soul of the faithful departed was introduced by private devotion. The Church has recognized the pious custom in these words: "The confidence of the faithful that the offering of the thirty so-called Gregorian Masses for one soul has a special efficacy for the deliverance of that soul from purgatory, is pious and reasonable, and the custom of having these Masses said is approved by the Church" (Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, March 15, 1884). In this Decree mention is made only of offering

Mass for one soul, and, as far as we know, a strictly so called Gregorian Mass cycle is to be offered for one soul only. There is no objection, however, to saying thirty Masses on consecutive days for the deceased members of a family or any group of the faithful departed. The one thing the Church insists upon when an agreement is made with the one who gives the offering is that the promised religious work—here the Holy Masses—is performed as promised. Wherefore, a Decree of December 12, 1912 (*Acta Ap. Sedis*, V, 32), insists that, when a cycle of Gregorian Mass is promised, it may not be interrupted, nor should several Masses be said on one day to complete the number.

MODESTY IN DRESS

Question: A subscriber to THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW refers to a letter of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, August 23, 1928, given in the REVIEW (September, 1930, page 1328), in which the Sacred Congregation describes in detail the dress of girls and young women that is to be avoided as unbecoming to Christians. Our correspondent says that he has tried to insist on the observance of the directions of the Sacred Congregation for omen appearing at parochial social events, but has met with little or no success and with a great deal of criticism. The pastor has been plainly told that in all other parishes round about no priest bothers about those matters. He wants to know whether he should continue in his insistence or cease.

Answer: The difficulty is to get some uniform standard of what is becoming or unbecoming dress for women. If we take the particulars mentioned in the letter of the Sacred Congregation, and ask whether respectable and practical Catholic young women in the United States would consider the dress described in that letter immodest, we should find, judging from actual facts, that they would not consider it immodest. Perhaps the Sacred Congregation had only in view a particular country and its manners and customs, and we doubt whether any general rules on styles of dress for women can be given in reference to what is considered modest or immodest. The manners and customs of people of different countries differ, and in the same country things at which no one takes offense today were at one time considered very unbecoming, if not altogether indecent.

Our correspondent wishes to know what to do concerning his

parishioners. We would advise him not to insist to the letter on the points of the instruction or letter of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, because, while it shows the mind of the Holy See, it is not a law. Moreover, the individual efforts of one pastor or of a few here and there cannot bring about a much needed reform in the manner of dress for women. The disregard for womanly modesty is brought about by the fashions, and we are quite sure that the dictators of the fashions are not Christians. The Christian spirit is far from the women's fashions of recent times. While an individual pastor may utter a general warning against the semi-nude appearance of women in church and at parish affairs, the only effort that would have effect would be for all the bishops to unite in fighting the evil and to get all truly Catholic ladies to take up the fight, for they would be best fitted to devise a practical way to create fashions which would be beautiful and modern and attractive, and would emphasize real artistry, not nakedness.

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

CASUS MORALIS

Civil Divorce

By H. DAVIS, S.J.

Case.—Bertha, a good Catholic, married Titius, a convert. They had one son. After a time Titius became enamored of a certain Balba, lived with her, and having deserted his wife, went abroad. Bertha pleaded with him for alimony for herself and the child. Titius replied that he would allow her alimony on condition that for a few weeks every year the boy lived with his non-Catholic grandparents (*i.e.*, the parents of Titius). He furthermore asked Bertha to give him his freedom by petitioning for a divorce on account of his desertion and adultery. If she refused to do this, he threatened to cut off all alimony. Bertha does not, of course, wish to marry whilst Titius is alive, but she is afraid that she may be reduced to destitution if she refuses the conditions, and that in the event of her death her boy may be brought up a non-Catholic. She, therefore, asks her confessor whether she is allowed to take the alimony and to petition for a civil divorce.

Principles.—There is no doubt that the Church has, in her own right, exclusive competence in the matrimonial causes of the baptized (Canon 1960). To deny this Catholic doctrine would be heresy, in accordance with the explicit teaching of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, Canon 12), and Pope Pius IX condemned the statement that matrimonial cases and betrothal belong, of their nature, to the civil jurisdiction (*Syllabus*, Prop. lxxiv). To assert what is contrary to Catholic doctrine and to act in opposition to it are not identical, and therefore, though a civil judge who contumaciously repudiates the Catholic teaching of the competency of the Church in matrimonial causes would be guilty of heresy, he would not be guilty of that sin if he presumed to settle the matrimonial causes of the faithful (De Smet, "De Matrim.," 390, n. 5).

But matters of settlements that affect merely and principally the civil effects of marriage (such as inheritance and legal legitimacy) are within the competency of the civil courts to settle. It is obvious, therefore, that all questions concerned with declaration of nullity and the judicial separation of married people belong, as of right, to the Church in respect of her members (that is, of all baptized persons). Nevertheless, the Church tolerates the petitioning by a

Catholic married person for judicial separation from his or her consort, or a petition filed by the legal representative of such and the granting of such petition by a judge in the civil courts, provided there are just and sufficient reasons for the separation in the judgment of the Ordinary, provided also that the Catholic party cannot obtain civil judicial separation in any other way than by appealing to the civil courts, and provided that the civil sentence has no other effect than the mere separation of the married parties without attempted interference with the bond. The practice is only tolerated because no Catholic may repudiate the Church's right in these matters, and, consequently, legitimate permission from the proper ecclesiastical authorities for filing a petition for judicial separation must first be obtained.

(2) Furthermore, divorce (as it is called in the civil courts) from a merely civil marriage (which is not a valid marriage), or from a marriage canonically entered upon but dissolved or declared null by competent ecclesiastical authority, may be applied for by a Catholic or the legal representative of such (unless in a particular case or country such a procedure has been expressly forbidden), provided the petitioner does not acknowledge any right in the civil authority of dissolving the matrimonial bond, but merely wishes to be legally free to enter into a valid marriage without incurring the legal penalty for bigamy. Permission of the Ordinary is necessary before filing the petition.

(3) But, if Catholics wish to petition for civil divorce in the case of a canonically true and valid marriage, the following conditions must then be fulfilled:

(a) they may not intend to petition for a full divorce from the matrimonial bond, but merely that their marriage may be deprived of its civil effects, so that they may be freed from very grave evil which cannot be avoided in any other way, having previously got permission from their Ordinary;

(b) but, if their purpose can be obtained by separation only, they must petition for judicial separation, not for civil divorce.

(4) Similar principles govern the action of judges who grant petitions for divorce or judicial separation.

(a) Since the lay judge is incompetent in the matrimonial causes of the faithful, some authors have thought (cfr. Cappello, "De

Matrim.," 839, note 16) that the Church supplies jurisdiction to do what the Church allows them to do. This opinion is doubtful.

(b) No judge may pronounce divorce from the matrimonial bond.

(c) A judge may, however, pronounce sentence affecting the civil effects of marriage but with due recognition of the competency of the Church in such matters, and never against the express prohibition of the Church.

(d) He must have a very grave reason for giving judgment. The loss of his office would be a sufficient one.

(e) He should warn the parties and others (unless in a given country citizens have been effectually warned) that he has no power over marriage itself, but only over the merely civil and separable effects of it.

(5) A lawyer engaged in a case of this kind has analogous duties.

(a) He may indeed defend the bond of marriage, but he would be acting in matters outside the competence of civil courts. The Holy See has laid it down that such action may be tolerated, provided the Ordinary is assured of the probity of the barrister, and the latter urges no pleas contrary to natural or ecclesiastical law.

(b) When civilly married persons lawfully petition for divorce, the lawyer may lawfully plead.

(c) Where married parties petition for a divorce with the intention of contracting another marriage, only the gravest reason would justify a lawyer pleading in the case, for he need not approve of the intention of the parties, and his coöperation in their sin is remote and material (cfr. Cappello, *op. cit.*, n. 840).

Solution.—We assume that the marriage of Bertha and Titius was a valid one. Bertha, on being deserted by her husband (who also, it is assumed, was guilty of adultery not condoned by Bertha), was justified in demanding alimony, and she ought to have sued him for it legally. She is, however, content with the promise of Titius, a very precarious situation, since, being what he is, he is as likely to break his promise as he was to violate his conjugal fidelity.

Titius begs Bertha to institute proceedings against him. Under the circumstances she is justified in petitioning for a decree of judicial separation, but he drives her to apply for a full divorce, as far

as law can give it. It is obvious that, if she does not petition for a so-called full divorce, Titius will not keep his promises, and she will certainly go without alimony for herself and her child. She may therefore seek from the law all the remedy it can give her, without of course intending to acknowledge the competence which the law does not possess. For her purpose she must obtain permission from her Ordinary. Should he refuse, she must endure the hardship.

Assuming that she has obtained permission, by petitioning for a divorce she does not coöperate in the sin of her husband, but rather supplies an occasion which he will use for living an irregular life. The circumstances entitle her to permit—not to intend or to cause—the subsequent sins of her husband. Assuming furthermore that the law obliges Titius to provide alimony, it has no means of forcing him to do so, as he is living abroad. Therefore Bertha will have to agree to the conditions of Titius. But if by doing so she will imperil the faith of her boy, she is on no account allowed to accept the condition. If the boy is too young to be affected by Protestant practices, or if the boy is old enough to understand the warnings of his mother that he should take no notice of what his grandparents may say on religious subjects, then she may accept the condition, for in that hypothesis there is no danger to the faith of the boy. Since, therefore, under the circumstances she is afraid of being reduced to destitution and fears also lest her boy, in the event of her death, may be brought up a non-Catholic, she would be justified in taking the alimony from her husband and fulfilling his conditions.

She must, however, see to the good Catholic education of her son, and, if he is well educated both at school and at home, there will be no danger to his faith by living for a few weeks every year in a Protestant milieu. Boys and girls have to do so in heretical countries, though this fact does not exonerate parents from taking all reasonable precautions. After the boy's return home, his mother should find out whether or not he was allowed to practise his religion; and, if he has received any wrong impressions regarding faith or conduct, she should correct them. Furthermore, she would do well to write to the grandparents, asking them to see that the boy practised his religion and chose as companions Catholic playmates. If, however, her son is being harmed from his annual visit, she should keep him at home and put up with the consequences.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

SOME POINTS FROM THE RECENT ENCYCLICAL ON LABOR

The Encyclical of Pope Pius XI commemorates the fortieth year of the issuance of the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, "Rerum Novarum" (May 15, 1891). The first chapter of the present Supreme Pontiff's Encyclical is devoted to a review of the effects which Pope Leo's epoch-making document on the Labor Question has produced. Then he continues: "The new needs of our age and the changed conditions of society have rendered necessary a more precise application and amplification of Pope Leo's doctrine. . . . In the course of the forty years doubts have arisen concerning the correct interpretation of certain passages of the Encyclical or their inferences, and these have led to controversies even among Catholics, not always of a peaceful character."

Then the Holy Father speaks of the authority of the Church in social and economic spheres in so far as they have bearing on moral conduct, of the rights of property and its individual and social character. He deals at length with the obligations of ownership and the power of the State, saying: "It is plain that the State may not discharge this duty [to specify by its laws more accurately what is licit and illicit for property owners in the use of their possessions] in an arbitrary manner. Man's natural right of possession and of transmitting property by inheritance must remain intact and cannot be taken away by the State; for man the domestic household is antecedent, as well in idea as in fact, to the gathering of men into a community. . . . The right to possess private property is derived from nature, not from man, and the State has by no means the right to abolish it, but only to control its use and bring it into harmony with the interests of the public good. . . . However, when the civil authority adjusts ownership to meet the needs of the public good, it acts not as an enemy, but as a friend of private owners, for thus it effectively prevents the possession of private property—intended by nature's Author in His wisdom for the sustaining of human life—from creating intolerable burdens and so rushing to its own destruction. It does not, therefore, abolish private ownership but protects it, and, far from weakening the right

of private property, it gives it new strength." Furthermore, the Supreme Pontiff treats of the obligations of superfluous income and of titles in acquiring ownership.

The principles on capital and labor occupy a large space in the Encyclical. Here are dealt with the unjust claims of capital, the unjust claims of labor, the principle of just distribution, the uplifting of the proletariat, a just wage, wage contracts, the individual and social character of labor, reconstruction of the social order, harmony between ranks in society, and restoration of the true guiding principle of economics.

The third and last chapter of the Encyclical deals with excesses that have come through free competition and the building up of a capitalist economic system of which the Holy Father writes:

"It is patent that in our days not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few, and that these few are frequently not the owners but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, who administer them at their good pleasure. This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life-blood to the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will. . . .

"Free competition and, still more, economic domination must be kept within just and definite limits, and must be brought under the effective control of the public authority in matters pertaining to this latter's competence. The public institutions of the nations must be such as to make the whole of human society conform to the common good, that is, to the standard of social justice. If this be done, the economic system—that most important branch of social life—will necessarily be restored to sanity and right order."

Then the Supreme Pontiff speaks of the efforts which have been made by the people to free themselves from the economic domination of the capitalists. Socialism in the extreme form of communism is severely condemned by the Holy Father as violating the fundamental rights of individuals given them by God. Even the more mitigated forms of socialism are contrary to Christian principles.

"Whether socialism be considered as a doctrine, or as an historical fact, or as a movement, if it really remains socialism, it cannot be brought into harmony with the dogmas of the Catholic Church, even after it has yielded to truth and justice in the points we have mentioned, the reason being that it conceives human society in a way utterly alien to Christian truth."

The remedies suggested against the social and economic evils are that economic life must be inspired by Christian principles, and the law of charity must operate. "The first and immediate apostles of the workingmen must themselves be workingmen, while the apostles of the industrial and commercial world should themselves be employers and merchants." The Holy Father asks the bishops and priests to help organizing labor and bringing about proper relations between employers and employees in a true Christian spirit. There should be intimate union and harmony between all good men (Encyclical of Pope Pius XI, May 15, 1931).

THE HOLY FATHER DEFENDS THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CATHOLIC ACTION IN ITALY

It seems that Hon. Giuriati had attacked the Catholic Action in a speech at Milan, and the Holy Father writes to the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan that the attack on that organization is in fact an attack on himself and on the Catholic Hierarchy. The Supreme Pontiff points out that the Catholic Action is approved by Article 43 of the Concordat. Besides, the said organization is merely an organization of Catholic lay persons for the betterment of Catholic life and has nothing to do with the political affairs of Italy. The Holy Father declares that he has not once but on every occasion urged the Catholic Action to refrain from political activities and work solely for the religious purposes of the society. The Catholic Action has heeded the warning to refrain from politics, and, if there have been some exceptions (which have been mostly unintentional), he has not hesitated to disapprove and correct the organization. He therefore maintains that it is most unjust to generalize from a few mistakes the society has made and to call it a political party. If it is objected that from this Catholic organization difficulties will arise between the Italian Government and the Church, it should be remembered that the spiritual affairs of the Catholic people belong by

God's commission to the Church, not to the State and Fascist party. The Church and the State can work hand in hand, and there need be no conflict between them if each is willing to let the other work in its own sphere. The State will not be disrupted by the Catholic organization, which will rather work for the better observance of law and order and the welfare of the people.

The Fascist Government need not complain of the Catholic Action, for the members of that same Government have always protested that they want to be Catholics. If so, they should be Catholics in fact, not merely in name, and should not say and do things which sadden the heart of the Church and of the Pope. The Church is certainly as solicitous for the true welfare of Italy as the State (Letter of Pope Pius XI, April 26, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 145).

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS RECEIVES CHARGE OF THE MISSION OF WUCHOW, CHINA

The Vicariate Apostolic of Nanning, China, is to be divided and the new independent mission of Wuchow to be created. The new mission is entrusted to the American Society for Foreign Missions (Letter Apostolic, June 30, 1930; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 152).

SOCIETY OF THE CATHOLIC UNION

The Holy See has approved the Society called the Catholic Union, whose purpose is to enroll members who will take a special interest in the promotion of vocations for the priesthood among Orientals and to help and assist seminaries for the various Oriental Rites. The Society is to be under the supervision and direction of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church (Decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, January 6, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 162).

INDULGENCES OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS FOR THE SICK

For the benefit of persons who cannot visit a church to make the Way of the Cross the concession had been made that by holding in their hands a crucifix blessed with the Indulgences of the Stations and saying twenty Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glory, they may

gain all the Indulgences attached to the devotion. Now the Holy Father grants sick persons who are too weak to say the twenty Our Fathers, etc., the favor of gaining the Indulgences of the Stations by devoutly looking at the crucifix blessed with the Indulgences of the Stations (which a priest or any other person may hold before them) and saying some short aspiration or prayer in memory of the Passion and Death of Christ (Sacred Penitentiary, March 25, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 167).

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS

Among the appointments recorded in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* of May 4, 1931, there are the following:

The Right Rev. Charles Alter, D.D., has been appointed Bishop of Toledo; the Right Rev. Urban J. Vehr, D.D., has been appointed Bishop of Denver.

Right Rev. Fileas S. Garand (Diocese of Ogdensburg) has been made Prothonotary Apostolic. The following have been made Domestic Prelates to His Holiness: the Right Rev. Msgri. Louis A. Verhagen (Diocese of Spokane), Michael Curran (Archdiocese of Dublin), Richard F. Pierce, Cornelius Crowley and James J. Lacey (Diocese of Ogdensburg).

Mr. George H. Paskert (Diocese of Cleveland) has been made Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great; Messrs. Herbert S. Dean (Archdiocese of Westminster) and Narcisius Cloutier (Archdiocese of Quebec) have been made Knights of St. Gregory the Great.

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Homiletic Part

Sermon Material for the Month of August

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Art of Praying

By CHARLES C. MILTNER, C.S.C.

"Two men went up into the temple to pray" (Luke, xviii. 9).

SYNOPSIS: I *The essential ends of prayer:*

- (a) *to adore God;*
- (b) *to return thanks to Him;*
- (c) *to beg pardon for sin;*
- (d) *to ask for necessary graces.*

II *The Pharisee did none of these things.*

III *The humility of the Publican made his prayer more acceptable.*

It was, as you know, Our Lord's custom to teach His divine doctrine by means of parables or concrete examples which, being understood, opened the minds of His hearers to some essential spiritual truth that they could not otherwise easily have grasped. The subject of prayer was repeatedly treated in this way, and that very fact shows us how indispensable He considered it that we should realize both the necessity of prayer and the importance of knowing how to pray well. When the Apostles said to Him: "Lord, teach us to pray," He replied by reciting to them the Our Father or Lord's Prayer. On other occasions He took great pains to teach them how to pray. This parable of the Pharisee and the Publican is only one of three that He employed for that purpose. He wished, it seems, to make unmistakably clear what are the necessary dispositions in one whose prayer would be acceptable to Him.

THE ENDS OF PRAYER

Prayer is a duty imposed upon us by the very first commandment of God. From Him we come, from Him we receive all that we are. He is our Ruler, our King. His will is our supreme law.

He is our Redeemer, by whom we have been not only rescued from eternal misery, but provided also with the means of obtaining eternal happiness. He is our Judge, before whom we must at last, each in his turn, all appear, and from whom we shall each receive a final, just and irrevocable judgment which will determine our lot in the life to come. He is our Heavenly Father who loves us with a love that is as infinitely tender as it is infinitely intense.

There is only one reason for repeating here these truths which we so well know and believe; and that is that in the preoccupations of daily life, amidst the bewildering number of temporal and external things that distract our attention, we are liable to pass judgment upon things, even on such an important thing as prayer, without adverting to the fact that we cannot judge of anything rightly without taking them into consideration. But with these truths in mind, there is no one who will not at once realize that prayer must include adoration of the Most High God, the recognition of his own littleness in the presence of His supreme majesty, the testification of his homage and reverence and respect for His sacred person and adorable name. There is no one so insensible to liberality as not to realize that to God, by whom he has been made the object of boundless generosity, he owes a debt of gratitude which, even by a whole lifetime of thanksgiving, he can never adequately satisfy. And sin? In many ways we all offend. And though the gravity of our offenses is measured by the infinite holiness and justice of God whom we offend, yet mercy too dwells in His heart. He knows our weakness; He has compassion on our misery. He has declared that a contrite and humble heart He will not despise. How, then, in the light of these facts can we come before Him without apology for our faults, without sincere and heartfelt sorrow for our sins, without a plea for pardon on our lips? The realization of our misery and of the need of His assistance will surely remind us that all other men are equally as dependent as we ourselves. If one but pauses for a moment's serious reflection on the actual relations in which one stands to God, one will recognize that, when a man comes to pray, the only proper attitude is that of the respectful beggar seeking an alms or the unhesitating confidence of a child seeking a favor at his father's knee.

THE PRAYER OF THE PHARISEE

Now, if we contrast all this with the prayer of the Pharisee, we can easily see his faults, and perhaps in them too some of our own. He goes into the temple to pray, and in that at least he does well. The house of God is primarily a house of prayer. But there is nothing reverent in his attitude. He stands erect and, instead of adoring God, he begins to recite a list of his virtues and good works. He dares at that moment to sit in judgment upon the poor publican who went in with him. He forgets that in the sight of God even the best of men is as nothing, and that whatever virtue he may have is the free gift of Divine Providence. He takes credit to himself for his fasting and his almsgiving, and he encroaches upon a divine prerogative by presuming to pass judgment upon his neighbor. His prayer proceeds from self-complacency and personal pride, and therefore, far from being an act of adoration, it is veritable mockery.

Are there no Pharisees in contemporary life? Perhaps none who stand before the sanctuary and openly boast of their virtues and their good works. But are there not many that come into the house of God to pray who in their own hearts have exalted themselves above their neighbor, compared themselves with him and judged him to be of inferior virtue, and, even while proclaiming their love of God, nourish enmity or even hatred towards others? And since God sees into the very hiddenmost recesses of the souls of men, how can their prayers be more acceptable to Him than that of the Pharisee in the Temple? Since He has declared that anyone who says that he loves God and hates his neighbor is deceiving himself, how can such a man's prayer please God? How can he come away from it justified in His sight? Virtues we may possess, and many good works to our credit, but in the words of St. Paul: "What hast thou that thou hast not received? And if thou hast received, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received? (I Cor., iv, 7). It is not for us to glorify ourselves either for what we are or may possess. It is ours to adore the infinitely good God who has bestowed upon us His graces, and to return thanks daily for His bounty.

THE DEFECT OF PRIDE

Another defect in the Pharisee's prayer was his complete failure

to take into account his own needs, to realize his own spiritual poverty and dependence. A student who enters a class with the conviction that he already knows enough about the subject to be taught, cannot be taught anything more about it. He has no sense of need for instruction, and therefore closes his mind to every effort to enlighten him. So it is also with a man who approaches the hour of prayer without any sense of sin, without a vivid consciousness of his own sinfulness in God's sight. Like the Pharisee, he will allow his mind to dwell upon the good that he has done, upon the evil that he has avoided, and not upon his actual imperfections and vices. Accordingly, instead of any feeling of unworthiness in the divine presence, any realization of having offended God, any sentiments of compunction and sorrow, any need for mercy and pardon, there will be nothing in his mind but a spurious complacency in his own goodness and a vain sense of superiority over other men. His mind will be closed to what he most needs to know, the clear perception of his need for the divine forgiveness and the divine assistance. His prayer will be void of every essential condition—of charity, of humility, of sorrow, of filial confidence. It may even, as the Psalmist says, be turned into sin.

HUMBLE PRAYER

God resists the proud, those who have and display an exaggerated opinion of themselves and presume to pass judgment upon others. On the other hand, He loves the meek and humble of heart and comes quickly to their assistance. This is why He assures us in the person of His Son that he that exalteth himself, even in prayer, shall be humbled, while he that humbleth himself, especially in prayer, shall be exalted, shall rise from his knees comforted, consoled, and justified.

Prayer is a kind of spiritual act, an act by which man is privileged to address Almighty God. It is, therefore, in that sense at once the most solemn and the most sacred duty of man as man. It is before all else an elevation of the mind and the heart to God. A mind thus truly lifted to the divine presence cannot but be overwhelmed with a sense of awe and sentiments of deepest reverence and holy fear. It cannot but be penetrated with the truth that before the divine majesty human frailty is as nothing. That is its

perception of the truth, and from this truth flows humility, and from humility charity, and from charity sorrow and resolution of amendment, and that confidence which, remembering the divine mercy, pours itself out in endless petitions for its own needs and the needs of those whom it loves.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Ceremonies of Baptism

By LAMBERT NOLLE, O.S.B.

"He put His fingers into his ears, and spitting He touched his tongue; and looking up to heaven He groaned and said to him: "Ephpheta, that is, be thou opened" (Mark, vii. 33-34).

SYNOPSIS: The ceremonies of touching the ears, nose and tongue before Baptism signify the effects of this Sacrament.

Introduction: In using ceremonies the Church imitates her Founder and acts on His principles.

I. The touching of the ears signifies the gifts of: (a) faith; (b) obedience.

II. The touching of the nose signifies the gifts of: (a) hope in Our Lord's sacrifice; (b) appreciation of and the zeal for virtue.

III. The touching of the tongue with salt signifies the gifts of: (a) wisdom and charity; (b) praise of God.

Conclusion: Prayers of praise especially at the Little Elevation of the Mass.

In working miracles Our Blessed Lord sometimes used ceremonies, not because they were necessary, but because He judged them to be useful. St. Thomas finds three reasons for the use of these ceremonies by Our Lord: (1) because they roused and maintained the attention of the spectators; (2) they reminded the people that He came to save not only the soul but also the body; (3) to teach invisible truths by means of visible things.

Following the example of her Divine Founder and acting on His principles, the Church uses the very ceremonies mentioned in the Gospel today. She orders the priest before baptizing to touch the tongue of the candidate with salt, and his ears and nose with spittle, and at the latter ceremony the priest is to say: "*Ephpheta*, that is, be thou opened to the odor of sweetness."

The Church prescribes these ceremonies for the very reasons for

which Our Lord used them. First, she wants the people who are present to be attentive, and to realize that baptism is a great and wonderful Sacrament, a miraculous resurrection from the death of sin. Secondly, she wishes to impress us with the truth that a body touched with the consecrated water of baptism is meant to rise in glory at the last day. Thirdly, through these ceremonies she wants to make us understand the wonderful and manifold effects which holy baptism has upon the soul. It will be useful for us to consider in detail what are the effects signified by the touching of the ears, the nose, and the tongue.

THE TOUCHING OF THE EARS

The touching of the ears and the accompanying word, "Ephpheta," signify *faith* and *obedience*. St. Paul tells us (Rom., x. 17) that faith comes by hearing. But before God bestows on man the gift of faith, his soul is deaf to God's revelation and unable to perceive the supernatural truths of God. Now, faith was given to us in baptism by the Holy Ghost, when we were born again of the water and the Holy Ghost. Therefore later on, as soon as we were told of the good God, we were able to believe because baptism had cured the deafness of our souls.

This ceremony signifies also *obedience*. Besides the gift of faith we have in baptism also received the gift of obedience. To hear the word of God is of no use unless we obey it promptly. Now, when we are made God's children in baptism, we also receive strength to obey promptly as soon as we hear His will manifested to us. Our Heavenly Father expects this prompt obedience from us, and as He has opened our spiritual ears in holy baptism we have no excuse for our slow or imperfect obedience.

THE TOUCHING OF THE NOSE

Touching the nose of the catechumen, the priest continues: "Be thou opened to the odor of sweetness." It may seem curious that, when the odor of sweetness is mentioned in Holy Scripture, it has always reference to a sacrifice. The words occur at the sacrifice of Noe (Gen., xxvii. 27), at that of incense in the holy tabernacle (Lev., i. 17), and in our Mass at the offering of the chalice. Now, the sacrifices of the Old Testament were the most solemn expression

of *hope* in the future Messiah, that He was going to reconcile us to God and save us from sin and hell. Thus, baptism opens, as it were, our soul that it may be guided and attracted by God's goodness and sweetness, and be encouraged thereby to put its whole trust in His power and His promises.

Good odor in the language of Holy Scripture sometimes stands for *virtue*. "We are the good odor of Christ," says St. Paul of the first Christians (II Cor., ii. 15); and we speak of people who have died in the odor of sanctity. Therefore, the touching of the nose signifies also that baptism has put in our souls the capacity of appreciating the virtues of others and of imitating their good example, so that we too should become the good odor of Christ unto God.

THE TOUCHING OF THE TONGUE

For the touching of the tongue the Church prescribes the use of salt, and the words "Receive the salt of wisdom." The meaning of these words is perfectly clear. By coming into our hearts in baptism the Holy Ghost brings with Him all His gifts, even the highest—the gift of wisdom.

Now, this gift can never be separated from *charity*. St. Paul assures us (Rom., v. 5) that this gift of charity is poured out into our hearts by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us; but He is given to us as soon as we are baptized. The combined gifts of wisdom and charity enable us to love God above all things and our neighbor as ourselves for God's sake.

It is not without significance that the salt, symbolizing wisdom, is put on our tongue. We are told that the dumb man, whose tongue was touched by our Blessed Lord, "spoke right." Wisdom enables us to speak rightly to and about our good God, who has given us so many wonderful gifts long before we knew of them, gifts which we shall never fully appreciate.

Let us therefore use our opportunities to praise the Blessed Trinity—the Father who in baptism made us His children, the Son who made us His brothers, the Holy Ghost who has filled our souls with numerous and precious gifts. The Glory be to the Father, the Gloria and the Sanctus at Mass and the "Te Deum" give us opportunities for the praise of the Three Divine Persons. But

the best means for praising God is the Mass itself. All our praise is imperfect and insufficient; but in the holy Mass, through Christ and with Christ and in Christ, we are able perfectly and fully to worship and glorify the Blessed Trinity. We are assured of this by the Church, who, after the Consecration and before the *Pater Noster*, makes the priest raise the consecrated Host and then the chalice, saying: "Through Him and with Him and in Him is to Thee, O God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honor and glory world without end. Amen."

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Who Is My Neighbor?

By A. E. MULLANY, O.S.B.

"Which of these three was neighbor to him that fell among the robbers?"
(Luke, x. 36).

- SYNOPSIS: (1) *The parable in today's Gospel.*
(2) *Why every man is our neighbor.*
(3) *The poor are the special friends of Christ.*
(4) *Christ identifies Himself with the poor.*

The parable in today's Gospel tells us that, first of all, a certain priest passed along the same road, and having seen the wounded man went on his way. Likewise a levite came and passed him by. One may suppose they argued to themselves that it was none of their business, and so did not trouble further about the matter. But a Samaritan who was making the same journey saw the poor man, and was moved to pity for him, dressed his wounds, and bore him to an inn, and had him cared for at his own expense. Then Our Lord asked this question: "Which of the three was neighbor to him who fell among the robbers?" And the lawyer said: "He who had mercy upon him." To which Our Lord replied: "Go thou and do likewise."

The answer was, of course, evident; but are we also not inclined to regard as our neighbors just those who are friendly to us, or perhaps those who are on speaking terms with us? With regard to the rest of mankind, are we not inclined to act as did the priest and the Levite, saying within ourselves: "It's no business of ours"?

This is the mistake Our Lord corrects in today's Gospel. He plainly indicates to us that every man is our neighbor.

WHY EVERY MAN IS OUR NEIGHBOR

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This is the second commandment, and is classed by Our Lord as one of the most important of all precepts. Therefore, it behooves us seriously to know and to understand who our neighbor is.

God made every man; God the Son died for every man; therefore, every soul is dear to Him, because He made it, and because His own well-beloved Son redeemed it on the Cross of Calvary. Every soul is precious in God's sight. God loves every soul, even the soul of the lowest and most unfortunate of men. Now, since all men are dear to God, they should be dear to us also. If we neglect them, we are neglecting the friends of God; if we despise and condemn them, if we offend them, if we speak ill of them or do them an injury, if we oppress them or grind them down, if we shun and avoid them, if we refuse them help, if we spurn them, then we are doing all these things to the dear friends of God, and to those whom His Son redeemed with His own most precious blood.

OUR SPECIAL DUTY TOWARDS THE POOR

We shall find poverty and misery, foolishness and sin, wherever we may go; but never should we despise the poor, never despise the sinner. No matter how low a man may have sunk in the social scale, no matter how far he may have strayed from the commandments of God, still as long as he lives there is hope, for the grace of God is ever at hand to save him. The Son of God does not cast him off. Nay, it was to save sinners that He came into this world. Did He not tell us that He would leave the ninety-nine just that He might seek for the one that was lost. It was for this that He left His heavenly kingdom, that He was born into this world, that He suffered, that He died. Therefore, my dear brethren, it is our duty to be kind and charitable to those who are dear to Jesus Christ.

The poor we have always with us. Poverty and its attendant trials, want and destitution, are no disgrace. Those who are blessed with this world's goods have here a glorious opportunity of laying

up for themselves treasures in heaven. Treat the poor as the special friends of Christ. Treat them as Our Lord Himself would treat them. Your wealth and riches you will lose at death; but the golden treasures you amass by your generosity to the poor will live for ever.

Remember Our Blessed Lord's words: "As often as you did this to one of these, you did it also to Me." And He has also told us that, if we give even a cup of cold water in His name, He will reward us. He will reward you for your charity with His own most precious gifts. He will reward you with gifts far surpassing all the wealth and splendor of this world. Look upon the poor, then, as your special care. Do not be indifferent to their wants. Take a greater interest in them for they are specially dear to Jesus Christ. Have pity on them. You who have abundance can never understand the hardship of poverty—of those who possess scarcely the bare necessities of life. They must eat of the meanest fare, and eat sparingly; they are never sure of their next meal, and often face starvation; they must live in miserable wretched hovels and labor in the often foul and poisonous air of factory or workshop. Their pleasures are few, for they cannot afford to spend their scanty funds on pleasure. Of comforts they have none.

CHRIST IDENTIFIES HIMSELF WITH THE POOR

These are our neighbors. These are the people to whom we should show brotherly love and charity. Help them as you would help Our Blessed Lord Himself. At the Last Judgment, Our Lord will say to the charitable: "When I was hungry, you gave Me to eat; when I was thirsty, you gave Me to drink." And the just, astonished, will reply: "Lord, when did we see Thee hungry and gave Thee to eat, or thirsty and gave Thee to drink?" And Our Lord will answer: "As often as you did it to one of these, you did it to Me." Now, my dear brethren, Our Blessed Lord meant what He said, namely, that when you give to the poor, if you give in His name or for His sake, you are giving to Him. Would you refuse to help or assist your loving Saviour in His need? No! the very thought is repugnant to you; then do not refuse to assist His poor. You can do so much to lighten their burden. You can do so much to dispel the darkness from their lives. You can make the sun

of happiness break through the black clouds of sorrow. You can bring joy to those in sadness. You can give strength to the weak and infirm. You can lift the heavy burden of anxiety from the shoulders of those who are bowed down by poverty. God has given you this power that you may use it with benefit to your fellow-men and to yourselves. "If thou wouldst be perfect," Our Lord says "go, sell all thou hast and give to the poor." But if you cannot give all you have, you can and ought to give something. What great joy you can bring to others by your charity, and what immense wealth you can at the same time lay up for yourselves in heaven!

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Ignoring God

By HUGH F. BLUNT, LL.D.

"And where are the nine?" (Luke, xvii. 17).

SYNOPSIS: The ingratitude of the nine; what they missed as the result of that ingratitude.

- (a) The results of that ingratitude in Catholics.*
- (b) The possibility of losing out by ingratitude.*
- (c) Our need of gratitude, especially in regard to Penance.*

Shakespeare is strong in his delineation of the crime of ingratitude. King Lear, who moves us to tears, stands forth as the tragedy of a father pursued by the ingratitude of his children. You all know that story. Yet, offhand, if you were at this moment asked to tell me the most striking story of ingratitude you have ever heard, I am sure you would at once refer to the one I have just read to you—a story, remember, of historical fact and not a mere parable. A leper to be cured, and not to show any thankfulness for it! It seems incredible. Yet, Christ assures us that nine out of ten such men did not think it worth while to return and thank Him. In all the world there never was such meanness.

In the time of Our Lord, and for centuries before that, the poor leper was as a creature accursed. What an affliction was his! It was actually a living death. He was nothing but a corpse, with only the remnants of life still clinging to him. His fingers were dropping away; his hands, his eyes, his nose, all his members

indeed, were filled with corruption. He was the most pitiable thing imaginable. So, when the Prophet Isaias visioned the afflicted Messias, he could find no more fitting description to apply to him than to liken him to a leper. Suffering of body with no one to alleviate it; suffering of soul with no one to sympathize. There were no hospitals to care for the lepers, for the hospital only came with the charity of Christianity. There was no Father Damien, no Brother Dutton, no Sisters of Charity, to make these sufferers know that they still were men. They were outcasts. Everybody was afraid of them. They were a menace to their fellow-men. Hence the severity with which they were treated. They were left to themselves—to live or die, no one cared. Charles Warren Stoddard, who wrote so sympathetically of the “Lepers of Molokai,” quotes an Eastern traveler, who describes two lepers sowing peas in the field. “The one had no hands, the other had no feet, these members being wasted away by disease. The one who wanted hands was carrying the other, who wanted feet, on his back; and he again carried in his hands a bag of seed, and dropped a pea every now and then, which the other pressed into the ground with his foot.” What a tragic, hopeless picture!

THE TEN LEPERS

Now imagine one such man, ready to die, dying by inches. What would he not give to be cured? And then some one tells him that there is a Man who has a cure for the disease. He goes to that great Doctor, and is cured immediately. Of course, you say, he would be eternally grateful to that Doctor. He feels the warm blood surging through his body, sees his corrupt flesh pink and fresh as a baby's and knows the miracle of new life. Why, of course he would be grateful!

But Our Lord tells a different story. These lepers came to Him, and begged for mercy. He sent them on their way, healing them as they went along. But what did they do? Were they grateful? Perhaps they were in a way. But they did not think it worth while to go back and say a word of thanks to Him. Perhaps they did not even give Him the credit for the cure. Perhaps they said: “Why, we did not have leprosy, after all. Why should we bother about going back to Him?” All that concerned them was that

they were well again. They had their health and strength, and they ignored the God who had given it to them.

But this is the point I want to make. They were cured, it is true. They were cured physically. But what of their spiritual state? They did not go back to the Lord, and as the result what a loss was theirs! The poor outlawed Samaritan who returned to give thanks to Jesus was, for his thankful heart, rewarded with the gift of faith. Suppose that they too had gone back. They too would have received the gift of faith; they would have become followers of the Lord—perhaps martyrs, great saints. All that they received was but the extension of a few years of life. Soon they too had to die, and very likely they died without ever finding the gift of faith. Their hearts were material and they received but a passing material reward.

WE CAN APPLY THE LESSON TO OURSELVES

He who runs may read. It is easy to apply the lesson to ourselves. The meanest sin is ingratitude, and so much hangs on it. How eager we are to come to God when we are afflicted! Here is a man who wants a favor. He prays, lights vigil lights, makes novenas, has Masses said. He thinks of nothing else. He must get that favor. Sometimes for months, even for years, he will pray for it. God grants him the favor, and then the recipient forgets immediately. He somehow gets to think that the prayer was answered because of his perseverance, and from that he goes on to think that it was his due. “*I have succeeded,*” he says. *I—always I.* “*God has answered my prayer. I got what I asked*”—not, God was good to me. Does he spend as long in thanking as in begging? Does he make as many novenas? Hear as many Masses? No. He gives a mere gesture of thanks and then goes his way, ignoring God entirely until the next time he needs something else. And God, who was eager to receive that man, who was waiting for the opportunity to shower graces upon him, has to forego it because the man does not come near Him. He has gained a material favor, but he has lost a spiritual kingdom. Indeed, he has lost more than he has gained, for he has offended God, since, as St. Bernard says, “*of all things ingratitude is most displeasing to God. It is like a hot wind that dries up the fountains of mercy and the streams of grace.*”

WE ARE IN DANGER OF LOSING ALL BY INGRATITUDE

We do not need to be cured of leprosy or some other great physical affliction to have reason to be grateful to God. All that we have, we owe to Him. The very air we breathe, the food we eat, the water we drink, the clothes we wear, everything that keeps the life in us, comes to us by the goodness of God. He did not need to create us; yet, He did create us. "What have we," asks St. Paul, "that we have not received? And if we have received it why glory in it as if we had not received it?" In other words, why glory in it as if it were due to our own efforts?

And yet, great as all these material benefits are, and all owed to God, how small they are compared with the spiritual graces, the supernatural life that He promises us! There is the danger just there that we are apt to measure our blessings by material standards. A Catholic may be grateful to God for his material prosperity, but he may never think of being grateful for his spiritual blessings. He sees things only through the eyes of the world. He glories in his sound body, and his sick soul causes him no worry whatsoever. And all this because he does not appreciate at their true value the graces which God showers upon his soul.

WE SHOULD BE GRATEFUL FOR SPIRITUAL THINGS

Now, we may illustrate this want of true gratitude by the attitude of some Catholics to the Sacrament of Penance. And this has special reference to the Gospel of today. Leprosy is a figure of the soul in the state of sin. Sin is immeasurably worse. It kills not the body but the soul. But here is a Catholic who goes to Confession. "I'm glad that's over." That is his attitude. He hardly says a prayer of thanks at the foot of the altar. He postpones his penance, perhaps rebels against it. He does not go back to God in gratitude for having made his soul clean. Somehow he seems to take it as his due that he has been restored to life, and he simply ignores God. What a misfortune for a man to ignore God! Sometimes we wonder at the attitude of renegade Catholics. We see them even become persecutors of the Church, we see them hating the Church, hating God. Why? I think that it all started with their lack of gratitude. They took the faith as a matter of course;

they trifled with it as a thing of little value, certainly not as something to thank God for every moment of their lives. They tried to get along without God, ignored Him. Ignoring Him, they ceased to love Him. There is a real danger for every Catholic in taking things for granted. And in the end they may be found with the heedless ungrateful nine, and not with the poor Samaritan who found God in a prayer of thanks.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

One Is Your Master, Christ

By GERALD J. FINAN, A.M., S.T.B.

"No man can serve two masters" (Matt., vi. 24).

- SYNOPSIS:* I. *Perpetual conflict between the material and the spiritual all through history.*
II. *Man's nature and destiny demand that he serve the interests of the spirit.*
III. *This means struggle against his passions and against the world. They cannot satisfy.*
IV. *Alternative is the love and service of Christ. He is our Master.*
V. *The test of our devotedness to our one Master.*

In the Gospel of this morning, Our Blessed Lord teaches us that an inordinate love of riches or an engrossing solicitude for temporal possessions is a great obstacle to the salvation of our immortal souls. In this passage, taken from the Sermon on the Mount, is contained the fundamental principle and substance of all Christian morality. It takes us back to the very reason of our existence and shows us the exalted destiny that has been set for us. We learned on the first page of our Catechism that we were made for eternal companionship with God. If we miss that, we fail utterly, no matter how much we may have amassed or enjoyed of the world's goods and pleasures.

That these goods and pleasures of the world do have a powerful appeal for us is but the testimony of experience. It has been so through all history. The perpetual conflict between the spiritual and the material which finds expression through the ages in the clash of Church and State, the struggle of the Church to maintain the interests of religion and of God against the usurpations of

covetous and irreligious rulers, is the same conflict that is being fought in the fields of education and social science between the forces of this world and the forces of the spiritual. It is the same incessant conflict in each of us, the same battle with that "other law" that St. Paul speaks of so earnestly and so personally, and to which so many succumb because they try to serve God and Mammon, seeking to taste and enjoy the unlawful pleasures of the world while they try to love and serve God.

MAN'S NATURE AND DESTINY

But, because of our nature—for we have been made a "little less than the angels"—and because of the destiny that is ours, we must serve the interests of the spirit. Our one concern in life must ever be the honor of God and labor for our own soul's welfare. This means a warfare; it means suffering, sacrifice, disappointment; it means self-denial; it means that we must be planted together with Christ in the likeness of His death if we are to be with Him in the likeness of His Resurrection; it means a constant struggle to subdue ourselves, the passions and inordinate stirrings of our affections, always seeking those things that are above and despising the things of this world.

"No man can serve two masters." He cannot be a follower of Aphrodite and a child of Mary. He cannot place his affection in money, and yet pretend to a friendship with Him who said: "Blessed are the poor." Whether it be the demon of impurity or gold or any of the other passions that seek mastery over the heart of man, the answer is the same: "You cannot serve God and Mammon." And the man who thinks he can give allegiance to both is not far from the condition of the traitor Judas, who sold his religion and his God for this world, who sold his conscience to fill his purse. He is a man who plays a double part, who does not wish to break utterly with Christ nor forfeit the good opinion of his fellow-men, a man who with one hand takes money from the Pharisees and with the other clutches Christ to his breast. Only out of the crucible of bitter experience do many men realize the futility of this world's goods. "Our hearts are made for Thee, O God, and they will not rest until they rest in Thee." The lustful cravings of unbridled passion cannot satisfy us. We serve them

and they cheat us of any real pleasure, and out of the remorse born of their indulgence comes the bitter conviction that to serve Christ is to reign.

The world plays us false. It cannot satisfy us. One is our Master, Christ. He is our best friend. The love and service of Him is the only way to peace here and happiness hereafter.

SERVICE OF CHRIST DEMANDS LOVE AND SACRIFICE

He demands our personal love and service. Our changeless Friend through the years of changing fortunes, our greatest Benefactor, He must come first in our thoughts and affections. No passion, no human attachment can usurp the place in our love that He has bought at so great a price. Hard though it seems to have for Him, our Invisible Friend, the sincere true love that we have for those we see daily, yet we know that it shall not be infructful, for He has told us: "Blessed are they that have not seen and have believed." The claims that He made for our love all during His life have not been in vain, for all down through the course of history, if there has been one distinguishing trait that marked the followers of Jesus Christ, it has been their undying love and attachment for their Divine Master. Who can pass over the example of St. Peter in his deep love of repentance, or the stirring picture of St. Paul travelling over two continents and enduring all sorts of privations and dangers in his efforts to bring the heathen to the true faith, and all this out of love for that Master. That same love has worked itself out in a service that has sent missionaries to the farthest corners of the world, leaving all that was dear to them and suffering every kind of hardship for the sake of sharing the light of faith with some of the other sheep that Our Lord says must be brought in that there may be one fold and one Shepherd. This love for this Master has created not only missionaries but also martyrs from the time of St. Stephen till now, and will continue to create as long as there are souls to be gained for the kingdom of God. It was love for this Master that nerved St. Paul to endure the sword of Roman fury, that led an Ignatius to welcome the Pantheon as his goal, and has inspired thousands in far-off lands to bear the cross and the flames of heathen cruelty ever since.

And all this was but in answer to the demands of a love for

us that stretched through all His mortal life and more. From the crib to the cross we were in His mind. For us He allowed Himself to be persecuted and condemned. For us He stood at the pillar while the Roman soldiers lashed His weakened frame with the stinging whips of torture and pressed upon His brow a mocking crown of thorns. For us He climbed Golgatha's steeps and was lifted aloft on a cross of ignominy to pour out His blood to the last drop amid the taunts and jeers of an ungrateful people. For our sakes He is here in the tabernacle to feed our souls with His Body and Blood, to listen patiently to our troubles as well as our joys. To Him we can come with all our narrowness, fickleness, heartlessness, mistrust, selfishness, all our misery and woe, and He will welcome each painful avowal with the tenderest sympathy and take all we tell Him as a token of trust and shower His benediction in even greater abundance upon us.

CHRIST OUR MASTER

This is the Master we must have. Him we must learn to love and serve. And what does that mean in daily life? It means that there must be a union of our will with His, a likeness between our thoughts and His, a bond that joins our heart to His. There must be no interest in life above the interests of Christ; we must have no purposes in life that are opposed to His purposes in our redemption. We must be so disposed and so determined that His cause shall be advanced that we can say with the great Apostle of the Gentiles: "Nothing shall separate me from the love of our Lord Jesus Christ." You cannot serve God and Mammon. "One is your Master, Christ."

The most obvious test of our devotedness to that Master is that we do nothing to offend Him. We shall faithfully keep His commandments. "If you love Me, keep My commandments." We shall have no part with sin, and then we shall try to imitate His virtues, His poverty of spirit, His meekness, His purity. We shall study Him, pondering over periods of His life from the manger at Bethlehem to the Cross on Calvary: the quiet steady gaze of the inward eye on Christ; the study of Him day after day under all circumstances and amid ever shifting scenes—and not of His

outward bearing, His words and actions only, but of the heart from which these spring. Thus it was that the Saints built up His image in their souls, a true living image which transformed them into a likeness of itself and became a tremendous power within them, drawing all things to Him who was to them all in all. "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." It is for us to search out that Way, to know that Truth, so as to reach eternal Life with Him in Heaven. "One is your Master, Christ," and to serve Him is to reign. Amen.

Book Reviews

THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION

The professor of theology may at times be somewhat disturbed when he hears and reads of the discoveries made by ethnologists concerning the religion and morality of primitive peoples. He is informed that tribes of low culture are entirely without religion and morality, that the concepts of moral right or wrong have been laboriously discovered in the course of centuries, that religion is a product of slow evolution, and that in the earliest stages of culture there was the grossest idolatry and worship of animals.

How much of this lurid picture is really true? We must admit that the religious concepts of some of the primitive peoples are decidedly crude when compared with those of more advanced races. But at the same time there may be a remarkably high stage of spiritual and religious culture accompanying the most barren type of material culture. This is one of the well-established results of ethnologic research during the last quarter of a century. Numerous peoples such as the Pygmies, the aborigines of Australia, and those of Tierra del Fuego, have been intensively studied, not by men whom Dudley Kidd calls "swallow travellers," but by serious scholars who spent laborious days in acquiring a knowledge of the languages and customs of these backward tribes. And the result of their researches is that the earlier opinions propagated by Spencer, Lubbock, Letourneau, and others concerning the abject moral conditions of primitive people can no longer be maintained.

Fr. W. Schmidt, S.V.D., the well-known linguist, ethnologist, and student of comparative religion, has made splendid use of all these later researches in his latest work on the origin of religion.¹ His larger book, "Ursprung der Gottesidee," has made his name familiar to students of theology and religion the world over. But that is a tremendously voluminous work from which the average student will be repelled. We all needed a more convenient volume, embodying the results of the latest study in the field of comparative religion. But we did not want them presented with the bias of a Tylor, Frazer, Lubbock, and van Gennep, but with scholarly precision and honesty. Though Father Schmidt's views on the practical universality of primitive monotheism are not accepted by all scholars, he certainly has made out a strong case for the existence of a belief in one God among tribes which he calls "the ethnologically oldest." These are the Pygmies of Africa and New Guinea, the aborigines of Australia, the Veddas of Ceylon, the

¹ *The Origin and Growth of Religion, Facts and Theories*, by W. Schmidt, S.V.D., Professor of the University of Vienna, Translated from the Original German by H. J. Rose, Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews (Lincoln MacVeagh, The Dial Press, New York City, 1931).

Semangs of the Malay Archipelago, the tribes of Tierra del Fuego, and a few other scattered peoples living in the remoter regions. He has laid under contribution the works of practically all noteworthy writers on the science of religion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and gives a critical judgment of their theories.

Parts IV and V of this scholarly work—in which he discusses effectively “The Supreme Sky-God in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries” and “The Methodological Basis: Content of the Primitive Belief in High Gods”—are especially noteworthy. The wide array of data presented from many different areas makes this book acceptable not only to the student of theology, but also to those interested in ethnology and comparative mythology.

Our teachers of theology, students and seminarians will find this work of great advantage for supplying the lacunæ in the manuals of Catholic theology used in our theological schools.

ALBERT MUNTSCH, S.J.

MODERN EDUCATION

The genuine progress made by educational theory in recent years is attributable primarily to two things: first, the knowledge accumulated by scientific psychology (which is not to be despised because of the extreme and bizarre theories often confused with it); second, the steadily increasing extension of training to all groups of citizens, which now means that the children of workingmen, as well as the offspring of the well-to-do, must be prepared for life and not merely taught how to read and write. Since education is one of the primary Catholic interests, there is every need that teachers who labor in the name of the Church should keep abreast of the latest developments. In Germany this obvious fact has led to the creation of admirable normal schools—termed “pedagogical academies”—and to the formation of a corps of specialists. One result is a new two-volume lexicon of contemporary pedagogy, prepared under the auspices of the very well-known *Institut* in Münster, Westphalia, Volume I of which is now available in the United States.¹ One cannot too highly commend this work. Though it may in a measure reflect the views of a single institution having points of view quite its own, the book is nevertheless based upon the self-sacrificing collaboration of scholars throughout Germany. There are also a number of contributors from other countries. Naturally enough, German interests receive by far the strongest emphasis, but hundreds of American Catholic educators will find in the book exactly the matter they have been looking for.

¹ *Lexicon der Pädagogik der Gegenwart*. Prepared, under the auspices of the *Deutsches Institut für Wissenschaftliche Pädagogik* in Münster, by Dr. Josef Spieler (B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, Mo.).

From the vast number of possible subjects the editors have selected the most important in four classifications: pedagogical terms, institutions, educational personalities, philosophic theories. As an example of the thoroughness with which the first are usually handled, one may take the article on "Denken" (Thinking) by Professor M. Honecker. After a definition, the author discusses first the philosophical implications, then the pedagogical applications, and finally the especial characteristics of child thinking. I doubt whether this difficult topic has ever been handled more aptly in so brief a space. That the *Lexicon* gives an almost complete account of educational institutions in all countries is one of its most valuable features. The treatment of Chinese education, for instance, is notable for data, for discussion, and for bibliography. Naturally, the dozens of articles on schools and forms of training will be most welcome to anyone who seeks to acquire an impression of the tremendous diversity of the contemporary school systems. The scholarly but none the less always Catholic point of view is never more apparent, perhaps, than in the biographies. Here are personalities as divergent as Dewey and Dilthey, but the material about any of them is very seldom a rehash, being almost invariably distinguished by sound individuality and objective discernment. Possibly the American reader will relish particularly the discussions of philosophic theory, since this has become so important in our country. As an example of how this is treated in the *Lexicon*, one may cite Professor Switalski's discussion of conscious and subconscious activity.

In short, this *Lexicon* has been built for hard use and will wear well. Even if not everything is of the highest quality, the work as a whole is an utterly admirable complement to existing educational encyclopedias. It has the distinct advantage of not being too cumbersome, too fulsome or too uneven in temper and distinction. The firm but always well-mannered Catholicism underlying the whole work lends it unity and savor. It should be placed on the reference shelf of every responsible educator who can read German, and it ought to be cited unflinchingly as another tribute to the vitality of Catholic education.

GEORGE N. SHUSTER.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THEODICY

The great intellectual battles of the present are being fought in the arena of psychology and natural theology. Every religious problem is referred to one of these sciences for ultimate decision. Theodicy pronounces on the nature of the ultimate reality of the cosmic scheme; psychology gives information concerning the nature of the human self. On the answers offered by these two sciences, then, it depends whether religion has objective or merely subjective validity. Thus, preoccupation with these sciences is imperatively necessary.

Two useful texts dealing with the above-mentioned topics and restating them in modern terms have made their appearance. It is superfluous to remark that such texts are timely, for in the battle for truth we always have to forge new weapons, or at least retemper the old ones.

An elementary treatise on psychology such as we owe to the pen of Father Barrett is not out of place.¹ Everybody now dabbles in psychology, which has become the most popular science of the day. A tremendous amount of misinformation on this subject is current among us, and some of it is exceedingly harmful, giving as it does false notions concerning the meaning of human life and in a very disastrous way influencing human conduct. The author furnishes an antidote to this widespread misinformation, and assists the reader in acquiring a right understanding of human nature and a clear insight into mental phenomena. He succeeds rather well in amalgamating the recent findings of modern research with the well-established results of Scholastic psychology. Devoid of technical phraseology, the text reads very pleasantly. On this account it ought to find many readers, though in a college manual stricter adherence to technical terminology and greater accuracy might be preferred. The review questions and examination tests constitute an attractive feature. The well-selected bibliography also will prove very acceptable.

Father McCormick has produced a very readable and lucid text on an abstruse subject.² However much our age may revolt against metaphysics, as long as we are rational beings we cannot get away from it. Pragmatism will never be able to satisfy the human mind. Man demands a rational justification of his ultimate ideas about the universe. Theodicy, therefore, will retain its place in the hierarchy of human studies until man ceases to ask questions of himself and of the world around him. The author's work meets a need that never passes away and that is especially acute in our days. Though on the whole following traditional Scholastic lines, the book is in a good sense modern. It is happily free from the dryness that has come to be associated with manuals of this type. Full attention is given to the important problems that arise out of pragmatism—agnosticism and evolutionism. The frequent references to St. Thomas and the well-chosen quotations from the classical writers on philosophy add both authority and freshness to the presentation of the matter. The book possesses great apologetical value inasmuch as it establishes the preambles of faith, and these fundamental doctrines must be placed on a rational basis in our days and defended against attack.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

¹ *Elements of Psychology*, by James Francis Barrett (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wis.).

² *Scholastic Metaphysics*, Part II, *Natural Theology*, by John F. McCormick, S.J. (Loyola University Press, Chicago, Ill.).

The Homiletic and Pastoral Review

Vol. XXXI

AUGUST, 1931

No. 11

PASTORALIA

Modern Need of the Spiritual Ministry

The most neglected thing in modern life is the soul. Whilst the body in every respect is made the object of solicitous care, the soul is left to starve. Philosophers of every description complain of the externalization and overmechanization of life, with the attendant fierce demands on vital energy and the accelerated rhythm of activity which thrust into the background the needs of the spiritual self within us. The restiveness so typical of the living generation is the symptom of the torturing uneasiness of a soul-hunger that is not being appeased. It is a sad fact that even the non-Catholic pulpit of today is doing little to satisfy man's spiritual hunger. The watered version of Christianity which it offers lacks the necessary substance to sustain the spiritual life. Of the great multitude outside of the Catholic Fold we may again say what was said of the poor of Christ's age: "And seeing the multitudes He had compassion on them; because they were distressed and lying like sheep that have no shepherd."¹

Care of the many souls who are spiritually impoverished, undernourished and diseased is the urgent and imperative need of our days. These souls may be lying outside our gates, but that cannot prevent us from bestowing upon them the loving care which will nurse them back to a healthy spiritual life. Do we not heal the broken bodies of those who are not of the Fold? How, then, can we be reluctant to minister to their spiritual wants? The spiritual ministry by which we serve them may not be required by our official duty, but it is surely demanded by the law of Christian charity. Our pastoral care, then, must be extended to those many distressed

¹ Matt. ix. 36.

and straying sheep that have no shepherds to lead them to rich and green pastures. If we seek authentic warrant for this conclusion, we can find it in the laws of the Church. Ordinarily, of course, Canon Law bears only upon the members of the Church and defines their mutual relations. When the Canon Law, therefore, sets forth the duties of a pastor, it naturally will speak only of his duties towards the members of his flock, for only to these is he bound by a legal tie. There is, however, a paragraph which looks at his duties from a higher point of view and lifts them out of the legal sphere into that of charity. In connection with our theme the paragraph is of tremendous significance and confirms what we have been saying concerning the larger aspects of the pastoral ministry. It reads: "*Ordinarii locorum et parochi acatholicos, in suis diocesisibus et parœciis degentes, commendatos sibi in Domino habeant.*"² Explicitly, in these words the Church recommends the non-Catholics who live within the jurisdiction of his office to the loving care of the pastor. Accordingly, the pastor who restricts his ministry to the members of his parish has not caught the spirit of the Church and is not in harmony with her intentions.

A well-known textbook of Canon Law offers the following commentary on the Canon just quoted: "*Propagatio evangelii per se ad provinciam pertinet Sedis quæ etiam hac ratione dicitur Apostolica. Quare in territoriis ubi non sunt Ordinarii locorum, universa missionum cura apud acatholicos ei reservatur. Ubi autem sunt Ordinarii locorum vel etiam parochi, vult idem canon ut sibi in Domino commendatos habeant acatholicos in suis diocesisibus et parœciis degentes. His itaque verbis quasi missio Apostolica Ordinariis et parochis concreditur, qua meliore et efficaciore quam poterant ratione conversionem acatholicorum procurent. Damnanda igitur fuerit socordia, qua fovendis catholicis contenti, omne studium revocandi acatholicos deponerent. Quia tamen, pro adjunctis, variant modi possibilis prudenter adhibendi, ideo Codex, circumspicte utitur voce generali commendatos sibi in Domino habeant acatholicos, ita ut ipsum vocabulum conversionis evitetur.*"³ Commenting on the same subject Dr. Guido Cocchi writes: "*Cum vera fides sit summum*

² "Ordinaries and pastors should regard the non-Catholics living in their dioceses as their wards in Jesus Christ" (Canon 1350).

³ Vermeersch-Creusen, "Epitome Juris Canonici" (Rome).

bonum, semper et maxime fuit cordi Ecclesiæ divinum Evangelium omnibus patefacere, cum hoc ad suam missionem et catholicitatis notam apprime pertineat; præterea Episcopi sunt successores Apostolorum et ideo missionarii ex nativo suo jure et officio, et quidem a potestatibus civilibus plane independentes. Codex Pastoribus animarum præscribit modum agendi cum acatholicis sive in territoriis in quibus adsunt Ordinarii locorum iuxta communem hierarchiam, sive in territoriis in quibus hi desunt. In primo casu, præscribitur ut Ordinarii locorum et parochi acatholicos, in suis diœcesibus et parœciis degentes, commendatos sibi in Domino habeant; præscribitur nempe ut: sive orationibus, cum oratio magis quam prædicatio conversiones obtineat, sive, data occasione, prudenter utantur mediis quibus ad ovile Christi acatholici alliciantur, ex.g., per diffusionem opusculorum habita ratione intellectualis conditionis illorum.”⁴

In spite of the extremely cautious wording of the Canon to avoid the reproach of proselytism, its meaning is perfectly clear. The Church in it imposes upon bishops and pastors the duty to interest themselves in the spiritual welfare of non-Catholics residing within their respective territories and to make every reasonable effort to bring them to the True Faith. Upon this broad foundation Pastoral Theology can build. In view of the attitude of the Church it is not surprising that writers on pastoral topics take it for granted that the pastor has real duties towards non-Catholics and that he must include them in his spiritual ministry. This conviction is reflected in the following passage: “My son, thus speaketh the Lord to the priests of the whole world: ‘Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature.’ For ‘God will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.’ Since, according to God’s holy intention, your work as a priest is not limited to Catholics only, but must necessarily extend to persons of all other beliefs, it cannot be a matter of indifference what attitude you assume towards them. As far as lies in your power, you must take the greatest pains not to repel them in any way, but rather to attract

⁴ “Commentarium in Codicem Juris Canonici,” Liber III, *De Rebus*. We add what Father Joannes B. Ferreres, S.J., says on the subject: “Ubi hierarchia catholica constituta est, Ordinarii locorum et parochi acatholicos, in suis diœcesibus et parœciis degentes, commendatos sibi in Domino habere debent, et curare de illorum conversione precibus fundendis adhibendisque aliis artibus, ut contionibus, collationibus, etc., quas suggerunt prudentia, caritas studiumque flagrans animarum” (“Institutiones Canonicae”).

them and make them susceptible of and well disposed towards truth.”⁵

There are others who hold that it is incumbent on the pastor to help in a spiritual way the non-Catholics within the confines of his parish. Father Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., LL.D., makes a very strong plea: "It is a truism to say that ardent zeal, the apostolic spirit, the missionary longing to spread Christ's true Gospel is, or at least should be, a characteristic of every cleric ordained to the ministry of God's altar. To the parish priest in the most Protestant town or village in the United States, not less than to the foreign missionary in Africa, India, or China, are applicable the words of St. James: 'My brethren, if any of you err from the truth, and one convert him; he must know that he who causeth a sinner to be converted from the error of his way, shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins.' In all probability there is no Catholic parish in this country in which may not be found more than one or two non-Catholics whom a little effort on the part of the pastor would speedily bring into the Church. . . . Christ's commission, 'Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature,' cannot be restricted in our day either to the workers in the foreign mission field or to the preachers of missions to non-Catholics here at home; it is binding, in some degree at least, on all those who have received from Him the transcendent powers of offering Mass and forgiving sins. That a goodly number of our American clergy recognize the reality of this obligation and consistently strive to fulfil it, is made evident by the muster-roll of converts credited to many of our dioceses from year to year. Hundreds of our pastors, more especially those in our larger towns and cities, habitually have under instruction classes of non-Catholics numbering from two or three to a dozen or a score. Here and there throughout the country is found an exceptionally zealous priest whose efforts for the conversion of his separated brethren meet with almost phenomenal success, or success which seems phenomenal to other clerics who either do not have, or do not profit by, the same opportunities of increasing the number of their parishioners. Granting that conditions vary considerably in different parts of the

⁵ T. Slater, S.J., and A. Rauch, S.J., "Rules of Life for the Pastor of Souls" (New York City).

country, that the Protestant soil is in some of our States hard and sterile, while in others it is rich and fertile; granting, too, that the aptitude to influence non-Catholics and gradually win them first to take a sympathetic interest in our religion and finally to embrace it, is notably less marked in some priests than in others, it may still be questioned whether a pastor who has exercised his ministry for ten or fifteen or twenty years without having to his credit a single convert to the faith, can flatter himself that he has done his full duty in the accomplishment of the second of the two great commandments: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' Lack of opportunity and lack of natural dispositions for the work may count for something in his failure to make conversions; but it will be profitable for him to probe his inner consciousness and inquire whether another factor in the failure has not been his lack of zeal."⁶ Indeed, it will be very advisable for such a one to do some honest heart-searching, particularly since the fact is well established that success in making converts is not conditioned on extraordinary mental abilities but depends chiefly on genuine zeal for the salvation of souls, on patience and other moral qualities which are not beyond the attainment of anyone who seriously strives. The very term, apostolic labors, suggests this abundantly.

SOULS IN DISTRESS

The number of souls hopelessly buffeted about on the sea of life in our days is legion. Spiritual shipwreck is a common phenomenon. The frequency of mental breakdown, the inability to face with courage the blows of fortune, the hectic pursuit of pleasure,

⁶ "Sacerdotal Safeguards" (Notre Dame, Ind.). In the same place the experienced author refutes an objection that might come to the lips of some who are anxious to justify themselves. "To insist," he writes, "as such a pastor is likely to do, that the spiritual care of the Catholic flock specifically entrusted to his ministrations engrosses all his time and energy, that he has quite enough to do in looking after his own people without adding the supererogatory work of evangelizing outsiders, is to make what at first blush may appear a thoroughly common-sense statement; but on examination it will be found that, while the statement contains something of truth, it holds a good deal more of fallacy. The implication that zeal in convert-making connotes any measure of neglect of a priest's parishioners is altogether erroneous, is so fallacious in fact that in nine cases out of ten the true connotation is the direct antithesis of that implied. Almost invariably the priest who is unusually successful in winning those 'without the walls' to enter the Church is a pastor noted for his spirit of self-sacrifice and devotedness to his flock, an exemplary cleric in his habitual bearing and conduct, a never-failing friend of the poor and unfortunate, a frequent visitor to the sick and the afflicted, a wise and patient counsellor to those in difficulties, a veritable spiritual father to all those entrusted to his spiritual charge."

the wild scramble for the goods of this earth, the prevalence of crimes of impulsiveness, the rapid growth of the criminal class, the disconcerting increase in juvenile delinquency and the oft-repeated matrimonial tragedies and scandals, all are indicative of souls that have lost their spiritual anchorage and are swept away to destruction. From the depths of a thousand souls arises the poignant cry for spiritual aid. Hence a modern psychologist very pertinently remarks: "The desire for spiritual care has not died in the souls of our times; on the contrary, it has become particularly acute but the church of today is not able to satisfy it."⁷ As a matter of fact, agencies of various kinds have been set up to meet the actual demand for spiritual care. Popular newspapers are running a department to which the readers bring their ethical and spiritual problems for solution. A casual reading of this department will convince us of the pathetic helplessness and also of the sincerity of the inquirers. The psychoanalytical clinic, enjoying quite a vogue in large as well as small cities, is nothing but an attempt to provide with spiritual guidance souls that are oppressed and distressed. Manifestly, then, there is a real demand for spiritual care.

Pastoral Theology will endeavor to impress the candidate for the priesthood with this deplorable condition of so many modern souls, and inspire him with an ardent desire to minister to their spiritual needs. It will try to widen the range of vision of the young priest so that his eyes will perceive not only those who are within the Fold but also the multitudes without the gates. More than ever the parish priest of our days must be mission-minded, and it is the office of Pastoral Theology to inoculate him with the apostolic spirit. No work, it must be understood, is closer to the heart of the Church. For souls the priest will be held responsible and for nothing else. Let a young priest enter upon his career with the profound conviction that the care of souls is his one great concern, and we need not fear that he will neglect the work of convert-making.

The essential point is the inculcation of an abiding sense of responsibility for the welfare of such souls as come within the radius

⁷ Dr. Werner Gruehn in *Archiv für Religionspsychologie und Seelenprüfung* (Berlin). The writer speaks on behalf of Protestants, and it is significant that he admits the failure of the Protestant Churches to minister to the spiritual wants of our times.

of the priest's influence. The idea of responsibility is a potent motive of action. It inspires and sustains. It imparts an undreamt-of capacity for sacrifice and prompts heroic deeds. It is the realization of responsibility that keeps the captain on the sinking ship until the last man has been saved. Think of the splendid energies, then, that will be stirred up in the heart of a priest who assumes pastoral duties with the vivid and definite conviction that he is responsible for all the souls living within the radius of his parish, and not only for the actual members of the flock! Here is an idea pregnant with astounding potentialities. The teacher of Pastoral Theology can release these latent energies and harness them to the work of convert-making.

In fact, the idea is almost oppressive. Pastoral duties defined in their narrowest legal sense constitute a formidable burden, but interpreted in such a liberal manner they would seem too heavy a load for human shoulders. To this various replies may be made. First, man is naturally inclined to minimize his responsibility. The sense of responsibility quickly wears off. There is far more danger that we will take our duties too lightly than that we will take them too seriously. Few men break down under the burden of responsibility. It is well, therefore, not to exaggerate our responsibility—for exaggeration is never good and always defeats its purpose by inducing discouragement—but to put it as strongly as the truth warrants. Familiarity will quickly dull its sharp edges. Secondly, those who do look upon their grave responsibilities with the eye of faith also know that God helps them to bear their heavy burdens and that His grace supplements human weakness. Thirdly, the truth is that the Saints accepted, as has been mentioned before, the pastoral office with fear and trembling. A strong sense of responsibility is a very wholesome influence and counteracts the natural inclination of the human heart to make light of the duties of life. Fourthly, a just sense of proportion requires us to state that, whereas the duties of a pastor towards his parishioners are duties of justice, those towards non-Catholics are duties of charity. This consideration will soften the impact of the responsibility on his conscience without, however, nullifying its effect. Not to lend countenance to the easy-going, who are anxious to reduce their duties to the lowest possible minimum, but to allay the fears of the timor-

ous and to place the whole question in the proper setting we quote a passage contrasting somewhat with our version and showing strong leaning towards conservatism. A one-sided, biased presentation of a subject is not desirable, and we do not hesitate to give this seemingly dissenting view. For its right appreciation we deem it necessary to observe that it dates back to the year 1871. At this date Canon Frederick Oakeley wrote as follows: "The great accession of converts to the Catholic Church during the last quarter of a century has not only added to the labors of the missionary or parochial priest, but has gone to form quite a new department of priestly duty. Previously to the time at which our converts first began to flow into the Church, with something like the force of a tide, the work of the English priests was almost entirely confined to the spiritual care of hereditary Catholics, baptized into the faith of their parents in infancy. . . . The number of conversions which have taken place during the last twenty-five years is far greater than those outside of the Church are aware. . . . And now I entreat of you not to think that I am here indulging in a boast, where I am but placing on record a simple fact. There is much to temper, and something to damp, the joy with which, as sincere Catholics, we must regard the accession of numbers to the fold of the Church. I cannot but fear that, while we are gaining from without, we may be losing from within: not, I would fain hope, in anything like an equal proportion, yet still sufficiently to mingle humiliation with our gratitude. I am not, as my friends know, disposed to take so discouraging a view as some others of the mischief done to our poor children, whether through the agencies of an unscrupulous proselytism, the neglect of their natural guardians, the influences of a withering secularism, or other similar causes of spiritual and moral deterioration. Yet, I cannot but apprehend that our actual resources are quite inadequate to the demands upon our zeal and vigilance, which are created by these accumulated dangers, and more especially by that which threatens us from the presence at our doors of a vast machinery for the promotion of irreligious or pseudo-religious education. I trust, and indeed most firmly believe, that our clergy will always regard the spiritual care of our own people, and especially of our children, as an object incomparably more important than that of the acquisition of converts, where the one clashes with

the other. There is no more prevalent mistake, among the many from which we suffer, than that of supposing that the quest of converts forms any definite department of our work. The converts themselves dispense us from all active duty in this especial province. It is they who come after us, not we who go after them. It is they who have to gain from the Church, and not the Church which has to gain from them."⁸ In our opinion the writer's misgivings are unfounded. Though possible, it is rather unlikely that one who is solicitous for those without the walls will be neglectful of those who belong to the household. And then, whilst it is true that many will come to us of their own accord, others will have to be sought. Besides, the Good Shepherd who in this respect also must be our model did not wait for the spontaneous return of the lost sheep but went forth to bring it back.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

⁸ "The Priest on the Mission. A Course of Lectures on Missionary and Parochial Duties" (London).

MIMICRY IN PREACHING

By THE RIGHT REV. H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

"It is a pretty mocking of the life" (*Timon of Athens*, I, i, 35).

I

The subject of mimicry in the pulpit may deserve a little attention. Mimicry can be of various kinds—of accent, of manner, of sounds. The present paper will perhaps serve to point out some of the dangers of mimicry for the preacher as well as its value under certain circumstances. *Quisque abundet in sensu suo*. In general, one might well say that mimicry ought to be, not a cynical, but a pretty mocking of life.

Probably the most dangerous of all mimicries is that of racial accent. In his "Pastoral Theology" Dr. Stang advises us: "Never ridicule people or imitate their peculiarities in manner or language. The 'Irish brogue,' the 'German accent,' the 'Canadian dialect' may amuse people at a 'variety show'; they should never be the cause of merriment or disapprobation in the house of the Lord." This excellent reminder will hardly tolerate comment. Every kindly feeling in our nature protests against such mimicry in the pulpit, although it may be a pleasant and practically a harmless diversion in the rectory. Many priests are excellent mimics. I have often laughed (immoderately at times, I fear) at the perfection and the drollery of their imitations of manner, voice, and even of mental peculiarities. I do not recall any time, however, when the fun was anything else but "just fun." Neither have I witnessed or heard of any use of such drollery in the pulpit. On the other hand, doubtless Dr. Stang had either witnessed or heard of it, and therefore his cautionary advice may find place here.

Mimicry of manner will be deemed only a little less dangerous if it should concern some particular person. But the question may arise, whether a preacher is permitted justly to employ a mimicry of manner in order to carry a certain kind of conviction with it to the minds of his hearers, or at least to convey wisdom through a comical performance. Here we touch inevitably on the greatly disputed question of humor in the pulpit—a matter discussed with some fullness in a previous issue of this REVIEW.

There can be little doubt that in clerical retreats and lay missions a great latitude is allowed in respect of humor and even comedy. The contact of preacher and listener becomes there quite intimate and unconventional, and there is often no standing on dignity. I recall that in one clerical retreat the preacher made one of his discourses a complete parable that carried its own moral without formal introduction or conclusion. He drew for us the picture of two priests who had been educated in the same parish school, college and seminary as classmates, who had been accordingly ordained together and had gone together through the same usual steps of the curacy and the pastorate. One was spiritual, the other was worldly; and finally came the picture of their several death beds. This, in the case of the worldly priest, was acted in comedy for the surroundings of the death bed, especially the covert appraising glances of his relatives who were estimating his earthly possessions from the character of his furniture and pictures, and were also speculating on the disposition of his wealth after his death. The comedy was not overdone, but the humorous portrayal conveyed a tremendous moral.

But now to a concrete illustration of pulpit mimicry. Gabriel Barletta, ranked as one of the "jocular preachers" of the fifteenth century, but withal praised by the Protestant Dargan in his "History of Preaching" as a zealous preacher and a devoted priest, rebuked wilful distractions in prayer in this fashion. He mimicked a priest engaged at his morning devotions (says Baring-Gould) as follows: "*Pater noster qui es in cælis*—I say, lad, saddle the horse, I'm going to town to-day!—*sanctificetur nomen tuum*,—Cath'rine, put the pot on the fire!—*fiat voluntas tua*—Take care! the cat's at the cheese!—*panem nostrum quotidianum*—Mind the white horse had his feed of oats. . . ." Baring-Gould comments on Barletta's question: "Is this praying?" by retorting: "No, Gabriel, nor is this preaching!" ("Post-Mediæval Preachers," page 20). But, really, who can justly say that it was not preaching? One must consider the times and the character of the auditory—and also the humorous capabilities of the preacher. A jocose recital, as well as a tale, may catch him who flies from a sermon. And so the long-debated question of humor in the pulpit rises once more to divide folk into two combating camps. Might not Barletta's recital have been taken in

good part, and so have done some good to its hearers? An obvious moral for us, however, would be to govern our jocose attempts by considerations of our own ability and of the temper of our audience.

Another kind of mimicry solicits our attention. It was the same Barletta who lent vividness to his appeal for almsgiving by imitating the sound of the church bell, meanwhile interpreting that sound by the Latin word *dando*, which he uttered *ore rotundo* and with grave and slow iteration: "Vos quæritis a me, fratres carissimi, quomodo itur ad paradisum? Hoc dicunt vobis campanæ monasterii: *Dando . . . dando . . . dando.*" The iteration was true to fact, and was not tiresome, therefore. We shall easily recall the tiresome iteration of the four-minute speakers during the World War, calling on us to "Give until it hurts," because "Money will win the War." They had not the advantage of a language such as the Latin, which could be turned to a pleasant mimicry of the church bell and thus be made to possess both an appeal and an argument for kindly giving. Barletta saw his chance and availed himself of it by capable mimicry—to good effect, let us hope. Was his humor less advisable than that of Dean Swift in his brief charity sermon that had for its text, "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord," and had for the body of the sermon: "Brethren, if you trust the security, come down with the cash"? But now I must hurry on to still other kinds of mimicry.

II

Olivier Maillard, another jocular preacher of the same century, in one of his Advent sermons represented a person tapping at a door, "*dicendo tac, tac, tac.*" At another time he spoke of the charitable donations for the souls in purgatory as giving out the sound of *tin, tin, tin* (pronounced in French fashion) as the coins fell into the alms-box. When the poor souls heard this delightful clinking of coins given in charity for their sake, the preacher also imitated their cries of joy: *ha, ha, ha, hi, hi, hi* (also pronounced in French fashion). The simple folk who listened to this mimicry no doubt relished it well enough.

I find also in the "Predicatoriana" of Philomneste another illustration—of animal mimicry, this time—which is rather elaborate. He places it in the sixteenth century. The preacher was inclined

towards buffoonery, he says, and in a Christmas sermon "deemed it desirable to describe somewhat picturesquely the scene of the Nativity. He said that the cock was the first to announce, at break of day, the glorious Birth of Christ, by crowing again and again, *Christus natus est*. The preacher imitated the crowing of chanticleer. Next (he continued) the ox, impatient to know where the Saviour was born, began to low *Ubi, ubi*. Whereupon a sheep replied, *In Beethleem, in Beethleem*, which phrases the preacher bleated, just as he had previously imitated the lowing of the ox. Finally, the ass invited them all to come to the cave, braying, *Eamus, eamus*." Philomneste drily comments: "The rumor was that the preacher surpassed himself when mimicking the braying of the jackass."

The passages I have borrowed from Philomneste are scattered through his pages without any relevance to one another or to the subject of mimicry in the pulpit. I was amused at them. But afterwards I was rather startled at finding St. Augustine mimicking the unpleasant cry of a crow in a sermon rebuking such of his hearers as were always putting off their conversion until "to-morrow." "*Cras, cras*," said the Saint of Hippo, "was their constant cry—the voice of a crow." But the crow which legend associated with the scene of Calvary came at length to grief!

A milder form of mimicry is illustrated by an anecdote told by Jean Raulin, a fifteenth-century preacher, in a sermon on widowhood. Philomneste notes that the story has been translated from Latin into both prose and verse, but that no modern author approaches the *naïveté* of the original. A widow came to her parish-priest asking advice whether or no she should marry again, as she had no helper but had a good servant skilled in her husband's art. "Well, take him," said the pastor. She objected: "But from being my servant, he may become my master." "Then don't take him," said the pastor. "What shall I do?" she cried, "I can't do the work my husband did, unless I have one." The pastor replied: "Well, take him." The widow objected: "But if he should turn out bad and wish to run through my fortune?" The pastor replied: "Then, don't take him." And so the pastor continued to play up to her complaints and her hopes, but finally, feeling that she wished to marry the servant and liked him, he told her to listen well to the

church bell and follow its counsel. When she heard the bell, her wish interpreted it as saying: "Take your servant, Take your servant." She did so, only to find that he started beating her, as he was now her master. She complained to the pastor, cursing the hour in which she had listened to his advice. "Ah," he replied, "you did not listen closely to what the bells said." He rang the bells, and then she heard them saying: "Don't take him, Don't take him." We may justly surmise that Raulin mimicked the sound of the bells: "Take—your—servant"; and later: "Do—not—take—him, Do—not—take—him." The amusing story is simply a humorous picturing of our English caution that the wish is father to the thought. The use of such an anecdote at a Mission would probably approximate the use of it by Raulin for his time and audience. There has been too hasty criticism of the "jocular" preachers.

III

Were such devices of mimicry confined to Catholic preachers? Philomneste discusses Lutheran preaching, and remarks (I translate): "Since there is question here of Lutherans, we may say that Luther also preached and that, despite his talents and his learning (for he had both), he did not disdain to conform to the spirit of his time, a spirit of *bizarrerie* and triviality which dishonored the pulpit. To prove this, we shall content ourselves with citing the following fragment taken from his sermon on 'The Trumpet of the Last Judgment': 'When Sodom and Gomorrah,' said he, 'were destroyed in the twinkling of an eye, the inhabitants of those cities, men, women and children, fell dead and were tossed about in the depths of hell. Then no one found time to count his money or to gad about with the p. . . ., but in an instant all that lived fell dead. It was the timbal and the trumpet of the good God; thus it was that it sent forth its sound: *poumerlé poump! poumerlé poump! pliz, plaz! schmi, schmir!* This was the beat of the drum of God our Lord, or, as Paul says, the voice of the archangel and the trumpet of God. For, whensoever God thunders, it is almost like the beating of a drum, *poumerlé poump!* That is the war-cry and the *taratan-tara* of the good God. Then all the heavens will echo with the sound: *kir, kir! poumerlé poump!* . . . (See the complete passage in Floegel, "Geschichte des komischen Litteratur," I, p. 258.) And yet this is

the style in which the rude preacher of the Reformation expressed himself! How many other buffooneries should we have to cite if we wished to report all of his scurrilous clownings against the Court of Rome and against those who displeased him!" (pages 104, 105). In a footnote another sample of Luther's abusiveness is given; but there is no mimicry involved, and so I pass it over. But it may not have been improper to call attention to the "Predicatoriana," which a writer in Blackwood's called "a rare and curious volume," and which therefore may not be easily accessible to my readers. In the mimicking words, Philomneste evidently gives equivalent French pronunciations.

IV

In the present paper I have tried to speak guardedly, because circumstances alter cases. The levity of some post-medieval preachers has appeared scandalous to some of our separated brethren, and has been solemnly rebuked as well on the Catholic side. Nevertheless, these olden preachers seem to have been zealous and self-denying men. It seems proper to transcribe some words from Chester-ton's "Orthodoxy" that translate my doubts into striking antitheses: "A characteristic of the great saints is their levity. Angels can fly because they take themselves lightly. This has been always the instinct of Christendom. . . . Pride is the downward drag of all things into an easy solemnity. One 'settles down' into a sort of selfish seriousness; but one has to rise to a gay forgetfulness. A man 'falls' into a brown study; he reaches up at a blue sky. Seriousness is not a virtue. It would be a heresy, but a much more sensible heresy, to say that seriousness is a vice. It is really a natural trend or lapse into taking one's self gravely, because it is the easiest thing to do. It is much easier to write a good *Times* leading article than a good joke in *Punch*. For solemnity flows out of a man naturally; but laughter is a leap. It is easy to be heavy: hard to be light. Satan fell by the force of gravity" (pages 223, 224).

III. EVOLUTION AND PURPOSE

An Inquiry Into "Natural Selection"

By JOHN A. O'BRIEN, Ph.D.

The particular phase of evolution which has been considered by many as having dealt a fatal blow to the validity of the teleological or design argument for the existence of a Supreme Intelligence in the universe is the Darwinian principle of natural selection. Coming at a time when Paley's classic statement of the argument from design in nature enjoyed well nigh universal acceptance, the Darwinian explanation seemed to take the foundation completely from under it. Thus, Paley had reasoned that if a passer-by found a watch lying in the sand, he would conclude from the ingenious arrangement of its parts, designed to measure the passage of time as clicked off by the stars, that it did not just happen that way but had been made by an intelligent watch-maker. So likewise the intricate adjustments and delicate coördinations that are apparent in nature bear irrefutable evidence of the work of a Supreme Architect or Designer.

But what if the adjustment, the adaptation, were caught in the act of happening? What if the adjustment were shown to have been a very slow and gradual one, and its path of development could be carefully traced over a long period of time, back to its beginning in other organisms? Thus, Darwin maintained that chance variations are continuously occurring among offspring, and that nature selects those with favorable variations to survive, while the others are killed off in the ruthless struggle for existence that is constantly going on. The adaptations could no longer be thought of as consciously designed or purposed, but as the result of a chance or accidental variation which happened to fit into the environment and were thus selected by nature for survival. It was not fabricated nor even born; it simply happened and grew and was preserved. In consequence of the spread of this evolutionary view, Paley and his watch were consigned to the scrap heap as outmoded, and the world witnessed a very general surrender of the idea of purpose or design in the organization of the universe and in the operations

of nature. Since about 1880 even theistic philosophers have quite generally been less sure of the cogency of the argument from design, and many of them have fallen in line with the general procession and have surrendered it unconditionally, seeking to find new ground for theism secure from the tidal waves of evolution.

NATURAL SELECTION DOES NOT EXPLAIN ORIGINS

Does the Darwinian principle of natural selection actually undermine the argument from design or even weaken its cogency in any way? Let us scrutinize it closer. Natural selection explains the preservation of those organisms which are already better adapted to their environment than their competitors, but it fails signally to account for the origin of those very adaptations which enable it to survive and which when further developed may constitute a new species. *It already assumes that the adaptations have been made.* When made, they are marshalled before the tribunal of natural selection which passes upon them the sentence of death or survival. But under no circumstances does it give them birth or even undertake to do so. Consequently, it does not even touch the question of origins, the question: "How did this particular favorable adaptation come to occur? What are the factors which are responsible for its genesis?" This, however, is the vital question. It is the crux of the problem of the origin of species, which is the central problem evolution seeks to explain.

If natural selection does not account for the origin of the adaptation, then it devolves upon the other factor in the coupling, namely, chance variation, to explain it. This in the last analysis is to fall back upon blind chance to effect delicate coördinations of multitudinous factors to attain a definite end, without even knowing what the end is. This is to explain the solving of a problem without knowing even what the problem is, to say nothing about knowing the technique of solving it. It is of a piece with the logic which would seek to account for the formation of Milton's *Paradise Lost* by taking the letters of the alphabet and throwing them by chance upon a piece of paper. Even there the analogy lags. For in the operation of nature one witnesses not merely an occasional solution of a problem but its regular consistent solution. Thus, not merely one blade of grass solves the difficult problem which has baffled

human intelligence of finding a technique to convert inorganic matter into vital protoplasm, but every blade of grass in the world solves the problem with unerring dispatch and certainty. Can one imagine a person blindfolded throwing out the letters of the alphabet by chance, and having all these letters arrange themselves in such a way as to spell out *Paradise Lost* with its appropriate punctuation, not once, but every time they were thus blindly thrown out? The imagination reels and staggers under such a strain.

Is not the cogency of this reasoning weakened by the fact disclosed by the scientist that the vast overwhelming majority of the variations which nature "hits upon" do not prove successful in enabling the organism to survive in the ruthless combat for existence and are, therefore, sloughed off as abortive? Nature is not to be viewed as proceeding after the fashion of an expert artificer who turns out a successful device in his first venture and wastes no effort on contrivances which prove ineffective when submitted to the test. On the contrary, nature is to be envisaged, according to the naturalist, as proceeding in a groping, halting manner, by a trial and error process, throwing out hundreds of variations until she "hits upon" one that is effective, namely, one that is not killed off by the environment.

To change the metaphor, if nature be regarded as a marksman, she uses not a high-powered rifle and one bullet to hit the bull's eye, but a shotgun with which she shoots many rounds of ammunition in the general direction of the target, and continues shooting until some of the shot which has been scattered all around the target finally lands. Take, for example, the method of fertilization used by the salmon. Many thousands of ova and spermatozoa are discharged into the water and perhaps only one spermatozoön will come into contact with one ovum to fertilize it, while the other thousands all perish—missing completely the targets at which they are aimed. Is not the method wasteful, clumsy and inefficient? More even than that, does it not greatly strengthen the viewpoint that chance or accident is adequate to explain the hitting upon the adaptation necessary to enable the organism to survive?

Let it be admitted at once that nature has a method of her own. Pregnant with apparently boundless resources, she does not follow the technique of human craftsmanship which reflects his very limited

amount of available material. Nor does the cogency of our argument in any way demand that nature pursue a method characteristic of a penury that is entirely alien to her. As for her method of experimentation by a sort of trial and error process, much might be said in favor of its pragmatic value when the experimenter is so limitless in resources. Furthermore, the idea of waste is based on the concept of needs in the face of a comparative dearth of resources to satisfy them. But where the resources are boundless can there be waste? Can one, for example, be said to waste air, when it surrounds us as a vast ocean on every side, and is just as abundant after it has been "wasted" as before?

The picture of nature proceeding in a blind groping blundering manner, throwing out at random thousands of variations, only an infinitesimally small number of which survive, embodies a fundamental fallacy. The fallacy is that of assuming that the variations which do not survive are not at all adapted to the environment and are therefore blunders on the part of nature. Since the percentage of survivals among the variations is so small, these are accounted for on the basis of chance or accident. The fact is, however, that all the variations show a high degree of adjustment to the environment. They do not survive because the number of living organisms which the environment can sustain is limited. The survivals may be said to constitute a fraction of the top one per cent—the supremely fit in the ruthless competition for existence.

In the recent nation-wide effort to find a potential genius among the students of America to prepare him to carry on the work of Edison upon his retirement, each State through competitive examinations selected its brightest pupil. These forty-eight pupils, representing the cream of the scholarship in the secondary schools of our nation, then participated in a competitive examination to determine the one who would receive the highest grade and with it the Edison scholarship. Would one be justified in saying that the forty-seven who did not win the award, who did not survive the gruelling competition, were therefore misfits? On the contrary, they represented the highest intelligence among the youth of America, and the only reason they did not all win awards was simply because but one was to be conferred. Similarly, the fact that all the variations of organisms do not survive is traceable, not to a blundering lack of adapta-

tion on the part of nature, but to the unusually severe character of the competition which permits the survival of but a few—the supremely fit.

DOES CHANCE EXPLAIN ADAPTATION?

Let us come to the heart of the difficulty, namely: “Does not this picture of nature’s method of procedure enthrone chance or accident as an adequate explanation of the adaptation finally arrived at? Does not the fact that nature throws the results of a thousand efforts into the discard for every one she selects for survival, indicate that the correct contrivance was the result of chance?” Let us see. If an horologist in his effort to solve the problem of the correct measurement of time turns out a thousand different types of watches before he perfects one that displays the high degree of accuracy which he insists upon as a condition for its escaping the scrap heap, would one say that the achievement was lacking in the evidences of intelligent design and was due to chance? Does not the fact that so many were discarded as unfit indicate rather the high standards required for preservation?

So, likewise, the sloughing off by nature of many variations in comparison with the few that are preserved indicates the high standards of adaptation required in the inexorable competition for survival. Far from enthroning chance or accident as the adequate causal factor where the standards of adaptation are so high and the competition so persistent and severe, it renders the need of intelligence operating somewhere behind the instrumental causal factors all the more imperative and unescapable. In all the adjustments in living organisms there is involved the delicate coördination of the activities of billions of atoms in millions of cells to effect a purposed end, and the human imagination will always falter under the effort to conceive of chance regularly solving with ease and dispatch problems of so intricate a nature as to baffle human ingenuity to understand, much less to duplicate.

No wonder that Huxley declared that no one with even a tinge of scientific knowledge could undertake to explain the phenomena of nature on the grounds of chance or accident, while Liebig, the great chemist, declared he could as soon believe that a book of botany could be composed by throwing a confused mass of printers’ type

upon a table as that the flowers of the field came to be as they are by blind chance. Since adaptation cannot be explained then on the grounds either of natural selection or of chance, it must be traceable to design or purpose, for there is no middle term.

Lurking at the very heart of the principle of natural selection is the idea of an end to be achieved, namely, survival. But is it possible to conceive of activity for the attainment of an end and at the same time bar the idea of purposive action? Is not the latter an inescapable corollary of the very idea of ends in nature? "If there is tendency, development, process, evolution," observes Professor Mathews, "then the infinite activity is working towards ends. True, we make such affirmation with caution. We do not dare to make too anthropomorphic any explanation of what we observe in nature. But one thing seems beyond peradventure: the mechanistic conception breaks of its own weight when one studies any process. If the fittest to survive are to survive, whence comes the concept of fitness? If there be no reason or purpose in the expression of life, why should not the unfit survive rather than the fit? Such a question of course sounds imbecile, but the mere fact that it is unthinkable shows how legitimate it is to see in the realm of activity something akin to purpose. Language, we admit, is here a poor medium of expression. Our vocabularies inevitably gravitate towards either abstraction or personification. The 'entelechy' of Driesch or the 'dominants' of Reinke, 'which sway whatever energies are available just as men use tools,' are simply ways of saying what the human mind instinctively affirms, that nature reveals a kingdom of ends as well as of histories. Scientists themselves are more or less consciously drifting into similar interpretations. Even a polemic for materialism sees that 'the more we learn about the nexus of natural phenomena the greater becomes our power to prophesy future events,' and can speak, though rather inadvertently, of a 'goal.' There is more effective argument for the existence of reason and purpose in the universe in the evolution of humanity than in the older argument from design. Indeed, it may be said to be the developed modern form of that argument. For science discloses a universe of activity characterized by traits so analogous to what we call reason and purpose in human beings, as to be unintelligible unless such qualities are recognized."¹

Instead of enthroning such blind and mechanical factors as chance variation, heredity and natural selection as capable of explaining the various forms of life upon the earth, the results of a careful analysis of the implications of evolution show that intelligence and purpose are not only behind the process of progressive development, but are immanent in it and are ineradicably interwoven into the warp and woof of life in all its functionings from the lowest rudimentary forms to the highest and most complex. Thus strikingly has the pendulum of scientific thought under the stimulus of evolution swung back to the conception of a Supreme Intelligence manifesting itself in the laws which hold universal sway in nature and in life.

¹ Shailer Mathews, "Contributions of Science to Religion" (D. Appleton & Company, New York City, 1927), pp. 396-7.

THE CHURCH IN GERMANY

By GEORGE N. SHUSTER

What is the outlook for the Catholic Church in Germany? It would be difficult to put a question the answer to which would be more interesting or harder to find. The twelve years which have passed since the coming of peace have burdened mankind with conflicts of a character different from the struggles of the past. History shows us nothing quite like the revolutionary masses dispossessed of everything by the processes of modern industry and finance, and now determined to secure control of all wealth by a sweeping attack on every institution, including the Church. To date Germany has been more strongly fortified against extreme Marxist views than Russia, its great eastern neighbor; but the inroads made by Communism are sufficiently evident when one observes that 13 per cent of the total national vote is cast for the "proletarian revolt." There are other sources of opposition, not the least important among which is the nationalistic reaction led by Hitler and denounced publicly by the great majority of the German bishops. On the other hand, Catholics have risen to great power and influence in the State. The Center Party has furnished not a few of the country's leading men, including the present Chancellor, Dr. Heinrich Bruening. A strong and fervent religious life is also unmistakable, and the effect of this has been felt throughout Germany. Facts as different in character as the liturgical movement and the strange, mystical experiences of Theresa Neumann have left their impress on the general public.

In what follows I have attempted to set down a few personal impressions gathered during a recent trip. Imperfect and sketchy though they be, indulgent readers may find in them some outline of the reality with which they deal. I shall begin by summarizing a number of conversations with members of the hierarchy and other prominent Catholics. Generally speaking, their views were colored by the severe depression from which Germany has been suffering—a depression which not merely hampered the outward ministry of the Church, but also threatened to disaffect whole groups of the faithful. Even so, nearly all felt that Catholics on the whole had en-

dured a signally severe test without flinching and attained to a position far better in several respects than they had occupied before the War. The Church is now far freer to act, less handicapped by its opposition to Lutheranism, and proudly able to develop an elite respected for its achievements in every field of endeavor. Virtually unanimous is the opinion that the "youth movement" has been an inestimable boon to the Catholic cause.

Cardinal Bertram of Breslau is one of the oldest and most distinguished among German prelates, and his See is among the most interesting to an observer. Few experiences on earth can compare, for Gothic magnificence, with attending a Pontifical Mass in Breslau Cathedral, particularly if one can observe everything from a stall above the sanctuary. This part of Germany—Silesia—is very pious, so that every available inch of room is occupied. Through this throng of reverent souls the aged Cardinal, looking very like Pope Leo XIII, advances to the altar, which on state occasions is decked with the splendor of the ancient cathedral treasure. Then it seems, indeed, that the ages of faith have returned; and one almost expects a cry of "God wills it!" to thunder through the vast, duskily lit edifice. Unfortunately Breslau is not so simple. Perhaps no other city in the republic has such a heavy social burden—the weight of so many poor, desperate, famished souls starving for physical and spiritual food. Nor is the national problem so acute elsewhere. Breslau is almost on the Polish frontier, so that infinite tact and wisdom in dealing with the political problem are demanded.

The Cardinal received me with memorable kindness in his large, rambling palace, before which an old retainer and a savage mastiff—stoutly chained, thank Heaven!—mounted guard. Above his table hung the photograph of an American benefactor—and, perhaps, I may as well say here that, if a cup of cold water can bring a benediction, then the name of Henry Heide will be blessed in all parts of Germany. Thereupon he gave me some insight into the work of the Church. Cardinal Bertram has always been devotedly interested in social problems, and not a few properties and treasures once owned by his See have been transformed into alms. His writings on the subject enjoy rare authority. But it was fascinating to catch glimpses of practical ways in which the diocese is attempting to meet existing situations. For example, the supervisor of welfare

work has built up a little organization which daily gathers potato peelings and other scraps in a house-to-house campaign. These "gifts" are then delivered to a farm and fed to pigs, which in their turn supply the revenue needed to carry on an unusual method of dealing with wayward girls. Mothers who have borne children out of wedlock are invited to come here with their babies and suffered to care for them as if matters were normal. Later every effort is made to secure positions for these women, with the stipulation that their children shall accompany them. The success of a venture thus based on the potato peelings is really one of the most gratifying I am familiar with.

His Eminence spoke at length of the political difficulties now rampant. Since he did not authorize me to repeat all he said, I shall content myself with remarking that his praise of the Center Party was wholehearted, and that his opposition to extreme nationalism made itself very clear. Regarding the first, he felt that, while the Party must function as a practical political organization and so not shrink from what is virtually a coalition with Social Democracy, it has avoided compromise on every issue involving Catholic principle. It is far more important that the Center do things for which it can be praised enthusiastically than that it avoid peccadillos for which it might be criticized. The extent to which the Cardinal has personally gone in trying to cope with perfervid patriotism is easily deduced from his attitude towards the Poles, which has been consistent through many years. Though the number of Polish-speaking parishes in the diocese is now small, all candidates for the priesthood must study Polish. "In this manner," His Eminence added with a smile, "I am always sure that any of my priests can go where he is needed." Small wonder that occasionally, in the wake of extremist gatherings in Breslau, the archiepiscopal palace should be besmirched with insults and calumnies!

Similar points of view reign in Munich, where the leadership taken by Cardinal von Faulhaber is a genuine phenomenon. Conditions are, to be sure, relatively different. The Capital of Bavaria has always been proud of its "cultural niveau"—of the fact that what is here done for study and art set a kind of standard for the whole of Europe. Accordingly His Eminence is greatly respected for his mastery as an orator and for his profound knowledge of

modern problems. More important, however, is the force of his character, which combines absolutely fearless courage with rare charm and religiously motivated depth. Few contacts made during my life mean more than the hour or two spent in his company; and while he would not agree that I should make public much of what he said, that prohibition was due to the circumstance that he feared the pessimism with which he regarded the contemporary scene might depress some. The Cardinal reflects all Munich's attitude of interest in and gratitude to the United States, the Catholic life in which he respects highly even if he has been frank enough to criticize some of its undesirable manifestations.

If one were to point out three characteristics of Bavarian Catholicism, the first would undoubtedly be the strength of the liturgical movement. "To renew all things by prayer," is a guiding principle carried out in diverse fashions. To begin with, ecclesiastical music and preaching are excellent. The first is not always plain chant, though this may be heard at its best in several churches, but the spirit of the *Motu proprio* is observed, not by clinging to a one-sided theory, but (a) by stressing the kind of music the Church wants, and (b) by rendering it excellently. Perhaps the tone of the preaching is set by the Cardinal himself; at any rate, its avoidance of bleakness on the one hand and ornateness on the other are striking. The Jesuits have taken a leading part in this renaissance of pulpit oratory, and a great deal of credit must likewise be given to the Benedictines. When one sees how these efforts are received and welcomed by the people, one comes away really convinced that the liturgical movement is one of the greatest avenues to Catholic solidarity.

Down the Danube to Vienna! One shrine after another greets the traveler—Salzburg with its ancient abbey and the beginnings of what, it is hoped, will be a new Catholic university, Linz; the vast Benedictine sanctuary of Krems, and the world-famed Institute of the Fathers of the Divine Word at Moedling. Vienna itself is almost fantastically poor, and of course Catholic activity is caught between the Scylla of charitable activity and the Charybdis of no money. Who can understand it better than the Cardinal Archbishop, whose life since the close of the War has been one long effort to keep the wolf from a multitude of doors? There never was an

archiepiscopal palace easier to get into. It seemed to be taken for granted that of course one wanted to call, and that of course His Eminence had nothing else to do except see one. You go into a fine old building, but an absolutely unmodern one. Winter was raging then—and how it can rage in Austria!—and yet such a thing as American comfort can be struggled towards here only by sending a man round to various draughty stoves with chunks of wood. If any of my friends among the parish-priests of our blessed country had to live in that “palace” one winter, he would doubtless emerge with a permanent cold in the head and the certainty of being saved.

Cardinal Piffl not only received me but promised to give an interview in writing. To my great surprise this appeared in the form of a manuscript written in long hand, which began with a glowing tribute to American generosity during the days of bitter need which followed the War. In general, however, it presented a picture of Catholic life in Austria and is, I think, a memorable summary which will be published here for the first time:

“You have asked me to describe the position of the Church in Austria. Well, the objective observer will find much light and also a great deal of darkness. Catholic faith has grown deeper and more inward, those who profess it have drawn together more firmly. The number of Communions—the most dependable gauge of religious life—has increased very noticeably. In part this improvement is due to missions and retreats.

“But on the other hand the terrible psychological effect of Austria’s defeat and the tremendous social need have resulted in great damage to religious life, which damage has quite illogically been placed to their own credit by the enemies of the Faith. Free thought and a Marxist agitation based upon absolute materialism have turned thousands and thousands of people into open enemies of the Church. There have been times when two outspokenly hostile fronts stood ready for battle—here Belial, there Christ. This conflict is particularly violent in Vienna and the industrial towns of Austria, and is rendered more difficult for us by a marked dearth of churches and a deplorable lack of priests. When a people is as poor as ours, the work of building churches can proceed only very slowly, despite the remarkable generosity of the faithful. But we have not lost our courage, knowing as we do that the forces which lie in the divinely given truths and means of grace conserved by the Church are inexhaustible.

"We sincerely envy American Catholics for their excellent schools. We do not have anything like them. Our public schools are interconfessional. While it is true that religious instruction is given in them, the processes of teaching secular branches are usually devoid of a religious spirit and are governed by the relativistic spiritual attitude of the teacher. We do have a number of Catholic private schools, but the attendance at them is hardly a tenth of the attendance at the public schools.

"In so far as the universities are concerned, the spirit actuating them has slowly improved since rank materialism has lost its influence on scientific research. Today practical Catholics can become university professors, and the number of students who are enthusiastically loyal to the Catholic cultural heritage has increased so markedly during recent years that in many universities they constitute a third of the entire student body. Even so we are all interested in the idea of establishing a specifically Catholic University at Salzburg. Of course, poor little Austria can never hope to reach such a goal through its own efforts, but we are counting on the aid of German Catholics and upon the sympathy of many in other countries.

"Please greet for me the American people, which I learned to know and appreciate during the days of my journey to the unforgettably impressive Eucharistic Congress. It is impossible to forget the great things I saw and the beautiful things to which I listened. We Austrians rejoice in the flourishing condition of the Church in America the more since it was once our privilege, through the Leopold Foundation, to help build many a poor little church in what was then the North American diaspora. When the history of this Foundation is written, the largely forgotten services of Catholic Austria to missionary work in North America will no doubt be remembered with interest and kindliness."

Yes, any traveler who devoted himself to seeing Catholic Austria during a week or two would find grave and gay, promising and threatening, circumstances in medley. As much can be said of virtually all the larger cities of Central Europe. In Berlin, for instance, where the contrasts between those who have and those who haven't are particularly striking—and where, by way of an illogical corollary, the struggle between faith and unfaith is tense—the position of the Church is unusually good and bad. We have been accustomed to thinking of this northern city as "outside the pale," forgetting that as a result of migrations and other factors it has one of the

largest Catholic bodies to be found anywhere on the Continent. On the one hand, a deepening inner life, a fine devotion to religion, any number of admirable undertakings; on the other hand, large groups of people who in a mood of economic despair have elected to believe in nothing. But there is no space here to ramble farther afield. I should merely like to add that the Church in Germany seems to have evolved a form of collective program to meet the demands of the new age, and a series of findings regarding the especial problems it faces. These may be considered in another paper.

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

By C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., M. A.

XI. A Sense of Humor

Recently a French writer published (my assent to his request having been given rather, I confess, through weakness than from conviction) translations of "Pages" from my little Memoir of Fr. Bernard Vaughan. He felt obliged to write a Preface. This was the Preface: "No need to say that this account was not written by a Frenchman! Especially, the frequent jets of 'humour' would not be admitted in the biography of a Religious by an author of our nationality. Our nation, says Joseph de Maistre, is of all the most frivolous but becomes the most circumspect of any when a pen is in its hand. This résumé, therefore, will be not only spiritually edifying, but an excursion into the realm of English thought. Even the jesting, we hope, will not shock over-much." "*Even*" the jesting!

This Preface inspired me with a variety of thoughts. To start with, I hadn't meant to jest! But how write, without a twinkle, about Bernard Vaughan, who twinkled all the time? Indeed, he was the kindest of men, and therefore, precisely, used always to laugh at me affectionately whenever we met. And I too laughed at him, but with a little more "circumspection," because he was an older man than I, and more important, and also so sensitive (under his mask of *bonhomie*) that I would not even have risked hurting him, for the world. Then I thought: "Is this why French literature, especially religious literature, never seems to me quite 'natural'? And therefore, not quite sincere; and therefore, not quite convincing?" If Fr. Vaughan was amusing, he was so: and, Religious or not, he ought to be shown, in his *Memoir*, to have been so. I agree—O, how heartily!—that one nation's sense of humor is quite different from another's. My blood runs chill when I observe the selection that the French translator has made of the passages he thinks characteristic, and chiller still, when I see what they look like in French. Having, indeed, foreseen it, I did not want the selection or the translation to be made at all; weakness, as I said, won consent.

Now, can a sense of humor be regarded as an ecclesiastical virtue? I think so, or as the sequel of one. For while a sense of humor may not be due to humility, the lack of a sense of humor may well be due to a lack of humility. (By humility I mean "seeing things in proportion," God and one's fellowmen and oneself included—if you can at all talk of proportion when you talk of God, which of course you can't; but you can if you mean your *perception* of God.)

For example, if I look at the Club I am trying to build in that appalling part of London near the Docks, Poplar, I suppose I could say: "Here is a gym, a canteen, a boxing-ring, offices. Here, I hope, will be (when I can get the money) a dancing room, a lecture room, a reading room and library, and a flat roof for children to play upon; and, upon my word, it looks pretty cheerful!" I suppose I might puff myself out with complacency and strut around inviting admiration. But when I reflect upon proportions, and see that at most it can cater for 80 boys once or twice a week, for perhaps 100 girls, 200 children, a certain number of women—and then think that there are 60,000 persons in Poplar (10,000 of them Catholic); when I reflect that what matters is *minds* and that perhaps minds will not be reached by what goes on inside those rooms, or perhaps only 10—or 6—out of the 60,000, will be deeply reached (reached in the way in which I want them to be), when I reflect on all this, well, I might cry, no doubt, but I think I would probably laugh—laugh *coram Domino*, and say to Him: "Lord, surely *You* are laughing; not 'laughing me to scorn,' as Your Old Testament keeps saying *You* do as regards *Your* enemies, because *that* I am not; but laughing most affectionately, saying: 'Dear little priest, thank you for your tiny gesture; it is a symbol of your good-will and of the generosity of your friends. It is a very good reason for Me to pour out My Holy Spirit upon Poplar; and that, I suppose, is what you really want. Your little club will tumble down some day. The Thames may rise and make a mess of its foundations. The successors of your friends may not want to keep it going. But the quaint disproportion between what you have done and what I am so glad to do in response makes—I acknowledge—My very intelligent Angels and Archangels raise their eyebrows—or would, if they had any. They do not have emotions; so they cannot feel surprised or disdainful. They are far too good to be supercilious. But

your club in relation to what you really want may seem so odd to them; possibly the whole human race seems odd to them—to some it was the occasion of their fall. But perhaps I have some low-down little imps who laugh like anything when they see, side by side, the building of a club-room and the saving of a soul—and sympathize with the very oddity.”

I suppose that my answer must be: “Lord, I thank You for what You say, and I echo all of it. And I am only too glad—O, O, glad beyond word or thought or secret hope—if You will regard the poor little bricks, the plaster, the paint, as my childish analogue of That which I want You, Father, to do through Jesus Christ in even one immortal soul, even one soul *adopted, incorporated, inhabited*. *Dakruoën gelasása*: Homer bequeathed to us that immortal couplet of words. I smile across my tears. I know my absurdity of performance; and I know my tremendousness of desire. And I know that my desire is tremendous only because it is inspired by, to be uplifted towards, transcended for the sake of, Yours.”

I confess that most of the American priests who have been kind enough to visit me on this side have seemed to have plenty of the sense of *jolliness*. One is never quite sure in what sense the same word may be used by different nations; for instance, I think that “homely” is used in two totally different ways here and in the United States. By “jolly,” I mean genial, open, ready to smile, showing no desire to pontificate, un-shocked by finding one mentally, let alone bodily, in one’s shirt-sleeves. (I remember having flown from London to Geneva and going straight to my host’s who lived in a tiny flat. I was exhausted, hot and sticky. My host showed me to the bathroom, and offered me, if I remember right, a Russian smock, red slippers and a rug, while my clothes were being dried and pressed. A foreign monsignore chose that very moment to come in. It took him a long time to recover; but he ended by doing so to the extent of taking his own collar off, for the day was swelteringly hot. His humility being real, he ended by summing up his own situation, and smiling. The American smile comes quicker.)

It is our duty as priests to see ourselves in proportion and not to be dismal *or* pompous about it. We have not to give ourselves airs in either direction. Who knows who may not catch himself being proud of his glossy curl of hair or worried because he is bald?

Strutting because he is good at athletics or ashamed of being bandy-legged? Pleased with his snappy business voice and reputation for never wasting time and knowing how much to a cent a commodity is worth, or affecting to have a soul above such things because he knows he cannot add nor keep accounts? Preening himself because he is welcome in silken drawing rooms, or hugging his heart because the police and car men salute him with broad grins? It is awful to think how little any one man counts! The first time I flew (once, I used to feel quite conceited because I had flown, and go out of my way to mention it), I looked down to where I knew a railway must be. I could not see it: we were too high. Then a minute smudge of white indicated smoke. There must be a train there—a thread so tiny as to be invisible. And inside it were infinitesimal specks—men and women, with their hopes, fears, anguishes, self-esteem! Had a giant's thumb wiped away the train and its passengers, the landscape would have looked no different; the press would have had a paragraph and a photo; the country would have carried on; a few people in America might have said: "I hear there's been a bad smash over in England." How nothing-at-all are bulk, looks, abilities, seen even in the perspective of one country or one score of years! How absurd of me, if I am a young priest, to give myself airs! How even more absurd if I am a rector and a middle-aged person, for by then surely I should have learnt better! But the humility of the Twelve Apostles, which intermittently must have been great and painful, was not dismal. Peter and John and James were not woe-begone. If they compared their personalities with their task, perhaps they had hardly time to laugh—they turned so quick to their Master and the Holy Spirit, and with one swift smile forgot everything else, especially themselves.

EDUCATION AND EDUCATORS

By PAUL E. CAMPBELL, A.M., LITT.D., LL.D.

Those who share in the work of education have need to know the history of education. History is the written record of the human race. True history must not degenerate into a mere chronicle of events. It must treat of tendencies which are perceived by the mind, and not of events which are discovered by the senses. It must not burden the memory with facts, but must interpret facts to illumine the soul. In some degree at least history must anticipate the lessons of time. Dearly bought experience makes man wise after the event, but the study of history gives man that same wisdom before the event.

We do not here take education to include all those experiences by which intelligence is developed, knowledge acquired and character formed, but prefer to limit education to its narrower meaning of the work done by certain agencies and institutions, the home and the school, for the express purpose of training immature minds. The subject of this work, as old as the human race, is the child itself. The human child is born with latent capacities which must be developed to fit him for the activities and duties of life. The history of this work of development must make clear to us the conception of the meaning of life, of its purposes and values, as understood by educators at various stages of the world's progress.

Previously we have emphasized the part of the parent, his primary right and obligation as an educator. But the modern parent and the modern educator who assists him in this work frequently take the modern school too much for granted. There is a certain measure of native inertia in human nature that stands in the way of change and progress, that prevents discovery of mistakes and fresh plans. He who would educate has need of stimulation and inspiration. When we look about us at the splendid physical equipment that brings the modern school very close to the ideal of universal education, there is a temptation to rest on our oars. We forget the spirit, the sacrifice, the enthusiasm of the pioneers. Names like Comenius and LaSalle and Pestalozzi are practically forgotten by a generation who are their direct beneficiaries. We

reck not of the cost in thought and effort expended by individuals, by the Teaching Orders, the State and the Church. We accept the vast treasury of traditions built up over the ages and give little thought to those who have bequeathed us this inheritance. The operation of the school becomes mechanical, and the mind of the teacher loses that suppleness which should quicken all teaching. The work of education must be dominated by high ideals, and the teacher must keep alive in his own soul the high idealism of his forebears in the field.

The Catholic teacher particularly must derive inspiration and stimulation from a study of the history of education. The Catholic Church, almost from her advent into the world, has stood in the front rank of the educators of the world. The greatest educational achievement in the world's history was the conversion of Europe. The importation of Greek thought and practice and culture could not stay the decline of Roman civilization, but the Christian religion through the conversion of Europe built upon the ruins of the old civilization a new civilization that gives every promise of permanence. It is possible for Christian educators to drift away in practice from the ideals proposed by the Church, but these ideals are the expression of truth, and truth is indestructible.

Education at any given time expresses the dominant ideas in philosophy, religion and science, and in its practical control gives concrete form to the relations between the temporal power and the spiritual power. These ideas and relations have varied considerably over the course of time. A study of educational history can alone give us a solution of the central educational problems. The mere recital of facts is not sufficient. Fundamental principles must be kept in view, and Christian revelation must always be accorded due importance.

The Christian religion has developed education in the full and complete meaning of the term. With proper regard for all developments in theory, practice and organization that affect the actual conduct of educational work, the Catholic Church has ever held fast to the constant elements in education, namely, man's nature, destiny, and relations to God. She has developed a practical definition of education that will survive all accidental change. This accurate definition may be worded as follows: education is that form of so-

cial activity whereby, under the direction of mature minds and by the use of adequate means, the physical, intellectual and moral powers of the immature human being are so developed as to prepare him for the accomplishment of his life-work here and for the attainment of his eternal destiny (Pace).

That the human mind did not in antiquity without the help of divine revelation rise to this concept of complete education need not surprise us. The Christian teacher gains a comprehension of the complexity of the educational problem at large by a study of the gropings of unaided human reason. Realizing our own abject dependence upon divine revelation we marvel that the human mind, alone and unaided, achieves so much. A study of the development and growth of educational theory and practice from the very beginnings of the human race gives to the Christian teacher a clearer comprehension of the doctrine and the aims of the Catholic Church in regard to the school and its position on many controverted points.

Where shall the history of education begin? Some writers ignore all work done previous to the glorious Grecian period. But the peoples of greater antiquity merit attention, though they may teach only through their mistakes. An account of what was done by them will prove useful by bringing out the profound modification which Christianity wrought. In China, in India, in Egypt and in Persia the pupil was required to memorize the sacred writings: the writings of Confucius in China, the Vedas in India, in Egypt the Book of the Dead, and in Persia the Avesta. All pupils were sunk in a groove of uniformity of thought and practice and of unvarying conformity with the past. Independent thought was out of the question, the development of free personality impossible. No effort was made to strengthen the consciousness of personality or give it value. In Hindu philosophy redemption was personal extinction.

China receives first place in the history of education because of the remarkable antiquity of her educational system, a system that had an influence on the destiny of the most populous nation in the world but did not reach beyond that. True it is that the Chinese are the inventors of paper and gunpowder and the first users of the mariner's compass, but they have remained in a static condition that is a marked characteristic of even the best Mongolians. But the Japanese have advanced as a world power since the revolution

of 1868 when they came closely into touch with Western nations. They are just as exclusive as the Chinese, but all classes and both sexes are given at least an elementary education. The writer on Japanese education finds himself forced to emphasize its present progressive condition rather than its historical development.

In Egypt we have the oldest civilization known to man. Egypt holds preëminence in all antiquity for science and culture. The social position of woman was higher than in most Oriental nations. The casual reader of Egyptian history knows that women could and did ascend the throne. In Egypt thousands of years before Christ there were men distinguished in the arts and sciences. The Egyptians were expert weavers, their work in coloring glass has never been surpassed and their respect for the dead is attested by their wonderful process of embalming and the Pyramids, magnificent stone structures erected as mausoleums. They were stirred to develop a notable genius for engineering and irrigation by the annual inundation of the Nile. Egyptian literature is noteworthy and abounds in poems, works on law, medicine, mathematics, rhetoric and religion, and even has a few novels. The Book of the Dead taught the natural virtues of justice, honesty, truthfulness, charity, economy and obedience to authority. Their religion was a superior form of paganism; the cultured few believed in the existence of one God. But the State provided no system of education for all. Elementary instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic could be easily obtained in private schools or by tutoring under special teachers. The learning for which the Egyptians were justly famed affected the culture and science of the Hebrews and the great nations of the classic period.

In China education was democratic, in Japan aristocratic, but in India education was restricted to certain classes. This was a result of the caste system. Advanced education was the right of the highest caste. But the artisans and laborers, the lowest caste, and the women were denied the advantages of education. Their language, the Sanskrit, is the oldest form of Aryan speech. Its literature is of value to the student of ethnology, ancient history and Scripture.

In Persia a warlike ideal predominated. Elementary education aimed at producing devoted sons in the family and able warriors in the State. The noblest adornments of the soldier were the vir-

tues. These natural virtues were the accompaniment of courage and military skill. Higher education was confined to the nobles and hereditary priests. The educational system made no provision for the training of woman, but woman had in Persian society a higher standing than in most Oriental nations.

When we come to speak of the Semitic peoples, we must mention first the Babylonians. From 2000 to 1000 B.C. they were the foremost people of Western Asia. Hieroglyphic writing was developed early among them. There was some knowledge of architecture and great skill in engineering and the mechanical arts. They had a system of weights and measures which has been the basis of all modern systems; they mapped out the zodiac and arranged the days of the week. They had immense libraries and much knowledge of mathematics and astronomy. We know little of their educational system but it was certainly restricted to the higher classes. Of the superior attainments of the learned class in art, literature and science, and of the high order of their technical instruction there can be no doubt (McCormick).

The Assyrians never advanced further than the Babylonians in education, but their work in architecture, painting and sculpture reveals a superior genius. When at peace they cultivated the fine arts which were encouraged by the maintenance of wonderful libraries.

The Phoenicians were the foremost traders and colonizers of antiquity. But they were a sensuous, immoral and cruel people, having no religious or intellectual safeguards against the dangers to their national life. They worshipped at the shrine of commercial success and prosperity. They trained youth with the sole aim of accumulating wealth and earthly power. There was little to commend in their system of education. The rapid decline of their power and their fame is a profound lesson to modern commercial nations.

The Hebrews maintained a belief in the existence of one God. As the recipients and custodians of Divine Revelation, their conceptions of life and morality were far superior to those of the Gentiles. Belief in God inspired their form of government and dominated everything else in their national and domestic life. Religion and patriotism were inseparable. They had an exalted idea of temporal government, and no nation gave woman so high a position in the family or the family so important a place in the State. But history

commends the Hebrews more for the content than for the method of their education. They produced no great works of art or science, and their achievements as a nation were insignificant. But they have been the benefactors of all ages in demonstrating the marked influence on the people of a theocratic form of government, and in preserving and conveying to posterity that deposit of moral and spiritual truth which in the form of Christianity was to leaven the world (McCormick).

We come next to Greek education. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, written about 1000 B.C., are the earliest works that give us any information. They presupposed a high civilization. Children were educated according to the requirements of their class in society. Female education, however, was strictly domestic in character. The girl received in the home her preparation for the duties of housewife and mother. The Spartan system of education dates from Lycurgus, the lawgiver, who flourished about 820 B.C. It was dominated by their conception of the State. The State owned the child from the moment of its birth. Everything was designed to train the hardy warrior. There was no instruction except private lessons in reading and writing. There was a measure of moral training. But the Spartan boy was permitted to lie to non-Spartans; he was permitted to steal but punished if caught. This system of education was designed solely for the benefit of the State. The individual was submerged; the boy was thought of only as a defender of the nation, and the girl as a mother of new warriors.

The Athenians were the most notable of all the Greek peoples for political ascendancy and educational achievement. Their government was the first example of democracy, and they surpassed in theory and in practice the best educational efforts that had till then been made. Their education was not a rigid State system but was conducted by individuals and had regard for the individual. It was an esthetic ideal of education—a cultured soul in a graceful and symmetrical body. It aimed at the development of the perfect man, physically, intellectually and morally. The obligation of educating the child rested upon the parents. Here we find for the first time the prototype of the modern secondary school. A form of this school was immortalized by the great teachers, Plato and Aristotle. Every human ideal was deified by the Athenian. Moral training

was begun in the home and continued in the school. The teacher was charged with the special care of forming the virtuous man by precept and example. Here we have the highest form of education that existed among pagan peoples, a form that reached its perfection in the work of Pythagoras, Socrates (469 to 399), Plato (427 to 347), and Aristotle (384 to 322).

Socrates had the distinction of beginning a great educational movement, of developing a method of teaching which was not only effective in overcoming the pernicious influence of the Sophists, but succeeded in giving a foundation to knowledge and a basis for the first system of ethics the pagan world had known.

Plato adopted and elaborated the educational ideas of Socrates and developed the most comprehensive educational scheme the Greek world had yet seen. He aimed to produce the highest perfection of body and soul. Only students with the requisite mental equipment were invited to take up higher study, others were relegated to the industrial class. The most promising were selected for a five-year course in philosophy that would prepare them for the office of ruler. He insisted on respecting the needs and interests of the child even in primary training; he emphasized the value of play and advocated the education of woman. But he failed in proper respect for the rights of parents; he made service of the State the end of education.

This golden period of Greek education was brought to full flower in the person of Aristotle. He was a disciple of Plato and the instructor of Alexander the Great. His educational scheme is substantially the same as that of Plato. Education he looked upon as a branch of the science of politics. Only the prospective citizen was to be educated. The end of the State is the happiness of its citizens and happiness consists in a complete activity and practice of virtue. "His influence on contemporary Greek education," writes Dr. McCormick, "was slight because his followers were mostly devoted to speculation and research. But later, in the Middle Ages when his works were introduced in Europe, his great and abiding influence may be said to have begun. The Scholastics accepted his system of thought, and in applying his terminology forever associated it with Christian philosophy and theology. They restored to favor his works on the natural sciences, for Aristotle was the first biologist

and natural historian, as well as the founder of the science and art of logic, and they perpetuated both his deductive and inductive methods. 'The Master of those who know,' as Dante styled him, has not ceased to influence Christian schools."

We may pass lightly over the history of Roman education. It was not distinguished for any notable development. The Roman citizen was practical rather than esthetic. He was interested in his home, his family, the welfare of the city. His ideal of education or child training was in consequence different from the Greek. In the early Roman period the education given the Roman child was supplied by the home. Reading and writing were rightly taught in the family and by the father. The religion of the hearth was the center point of the religion of the Roman, and the education was the education of the hearth. During the period of conquest domestic education largely prevailed. After the period of conquest Greek culture became predominant. Even in the decadence of Roman society during the Empire the school remained the last stronghold of pagan life and culture. But this decline annulled the practical purpose of education. The schools of the later Empire were futile and short-lived.

The decline of Roman civilization and the irruption of hordes of barbarians over Western Europe threatened absolute destruction of the educational heritage of the world. But in this fullness of time God sent His Church to preserve the treasures of pagan antiquity and to give to the work of education a higher idealism than it had yet known.

"Pagan education as a whole, with its ideals, successes, and failures," writes Dr. Pace, "has a profound significance. It was the product of the highest human wisdom, speculative and practical, that the world has known. It pursued in turn the ideals that appeal most strongly to the human mind. It engaged the thought of the greatest philosophers and the action of the wisest legislators. Art, science, and literature were placed at its service, and the mighty influence of the State was exerted in its behalf. In itself, therefore, and in its results, it shows how much and how little human reason can accomplish when it seeks no guidance higher than itself and strives for no purposes other than those which find, or may find, their realization in the present phase of existence."

(To Be Continued)

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

By HUGH COGAN, D.D.

II. Character Sketches from Proverbs

Some parts of the Book of Proverbs are very familiar to priests because they so frequently occur in the Liturgy. The portrait of the Valiant Woman, which ends the Book, is often read as an Epistle at Mass, and the beautiful personification of Wisdom in the eighth chapter forms the lessons of the First Nocturn on feasts of our Blessed Lady. There are many other parts which ought to be just as familiar, and a little garnering here and there may perhaps induce some readers to make a deeper acquaintance with this inspired Book.

THE WHISPERER

This social pest, who is also called the talebearer and the sower of discord, is frequently referred to by the Wise Man. His conduct is shown to be abominable in the eyes of God, and this is done in a way which creates a distinct impression:

Six things there are which the Lord hateth,
And the seventh his soul detesteth:
Haughty eyes, a lying tongue,
Hands that shed innocent blood,
A heart that deviseth wicked plots,
Feet that are swift to run into mischief,
A deceitful witness that uttereth lies,
And him that soweth discord among brethren (vi. 16-19).

Number proverbs of this kind are frequent throughout the Book. The enumeration is so arranged that the last mentioned thing is intended to strike us most. Not that it is always the most grievous, for evidently the shedding of innocent blood is a more serious sin; but the author mentions last what he desires to stress for the moment. In the Vulgate text, of which the above is the Douai version, the very translation singles out the last thing for special condemnation, for it is called the *seventh* over and above the other six. The original Hebrew, however, does not put such stress on the seventh. It reads:

These six things the Lord hates:
Yea, seven his soul abhors.

Again when the sacred writer wishes to give us an example of a thoroughly bad man—not merely a man who sins through weakness, but a malicious man, the personification of wickedness—he mentions as his last characteristic that he is a sower of discord:

A man that is an apostate, an unprofitable man,
Walketh with a perverse mouth,
He winketh with the eyes, presseth with the foot,
Speaketh with the finger,
With a wicked heart he deviseth evil,
And at all times he soweth discord (vi. 12-14).

The word translated by *apostate* is Belial in the Hebrew, so that the passage refers to a man of Belial, a son of the devil, in complete opposition to the man of God. He is continually plotting evil in his heart, and all his external senses carry out his designs.

If we desire to know why the detractor has such success, and why he is listened to so willingly, we get the reason in two proverbs in the Vulgate translation, which, however, are identical in the Hebrew:

The words of the double-tongued are as if they were harmless,
And they reach even to the innermost parts of the bowels (xviii. 8).
The words of a talebearer are as it were simple,
But they reach to the innermost parts of the belly (xxvi. 22).

The slanderer does his evil work by insinuations, by chance remarks, by words that seem of no consequence, but which leave a lasting impression on the hearers. His words seem merely to touch the surface, but in reality they penetrate. The Revised Version has the following rendering:

The words of a whisperer are as dainty morsels,
And they go down into the innermost parts of the belly.

Just as the glutton is eager for tasty bits, and swallows them greedily and with relish, so we, owing to our depraved nature, are naturally inclined to listen with pleasure to the narration of our neighbor's failings. On the other hand, there would be no uncharitable talk if there were no willing listeners, and this is the very remedy indicated in another proverb, which in the Vulgate is as follows:

The north wind driveth away rain,
So doth a sad countenance a backbiting tongue (xxv. 23).

Even if we are not acquainted with the north wind of Palestine, we know the north wind of our own climates. It is cutting, piercing, freezing, boisterous, and most people are glad to take shelter from its blast. If we meet the slanderer with a countenance cold and angry as the north wind, his trade will soon be ruined for want of customers.

Modern translations give a different rendering of this proverb:

The north wind bringeth rain,
And the backbiting tongue (bringeth) angry countenances.

Here the point of the proverb seems to be that the slanderer's words are not well received by the hearers, who are rather disposed to resent his whispering tongue. As a matter of fact, writers on the climate of Palestine tell us that the north wind is not a rainy wind, except when it blows very boisterously.

THE SLUGGARD

Laziness is found in all countries. An effort is required to overcome the *dolce far niente* habit which is ingrained in our nature. It would seem, however, that the sluggard flourished in the East. The Book of Proverbs has many references to him, and some of the sketches are most graphic.

Go to the ant, O sluggard,
And consider her ways and learn wisdom,
Which, although she hath no guide, nor master, nor captain,
Provideth her meat for herself in the summer,
And gathereth her food in the harvest.

How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard?
When wilt thou rise out of thy sleep?
Thou wilt sleep a little, thou wilt slumber a little,
Thou wilt fold thy hands a little to sleep:
And want shall come upon thee as a traveller,
And poverty as a man armed (vi. 6-11).

In the first stanza there is the contrast between the tiny ant, without intellect and yet a model of industry and foresight, and a man, the intellectual king of creation, sunk in idleness, with no thought

for the future. The second stanza is more dramatic in the Hebrew, where in answer to the question,

How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard?
When wilt thou rise out of thy sleep?

it is the sluggard who answers, begging for

A little sleep, a little slumber,
A little folding of the hands to rest.

And then the wise man concludes that poverty and want will overtake the sluggard as suddenly and irresistibly as a traveller—that is, a vagabond, a highwayman, armed for his depredations. The same truth is expressed in another proverb:

The sluggard will not plough in the winter:
In the harvest he goeth to gather—and there is none (xx. 4).

Then there is the description of the vineyard of the sluggard:

I passed by the field of the slothful man,
And by the vineyard of the foolish man,
And behold it was all filled with nettles,
And thorns had covered the face thereof,
And the stone wall was broken down.
Which when I had seen, I laid it up in my heart,
And by the example I received instruction (xxiv. 30-34).

And the sacred author repeats the above passage: “A little sleep, a little slumber, etc.”

Most of us have met the person who, when he is called in the morning, says: “Yes, I am getting up.” But he does not get up for a long time after, and only as the result of repeated calls. He also says that he did not hear the first call. The counterpart of this person existed in Solomon’s time:

As the door turneth on its hinges,
So doth the sluggard on his bed.

Prompt rising in the morning is a good criterion to distinguish the easygoing man from him who realizes the value of time, and wishes, in the words of the Blessed Thomas More, “to buy again the time that I before have lost.” When St. Jerome in his decrepit old age had lost the strength necessary to raise himself from his bed in the morning, he had a rope attached to the ceiling with the end hang-

ing over his bed, and by clinging on to this he managed to be up in time to assist at the public offices and prayers of his monastery at Bethlehem. His example has been frequently followed since.

There is also the utter futility of arguing with the sluggard, and trying to show him the sad consequences of his indolence, for

The sluggard is wiser in his own conceit
Than seven men that speak sentences.

The Book of Proverbs contains several hundred of such sentences—that is, wise and prudent sayings. Seven is to be taken as expressing an indefinite number. Hence the sluggard believes that his lazy way is the best, and all the wise men in the world would not convince him to the contrary. Not even the wisdom of Solomon would make much impression on the man who, when urged to go out to work, would reply as follows:

The slothful man saith: There is a lion without,
I shall be slain in the midst of the streets (xxii. 13).

And the person who is too lazy to eat is beyond all hope:

The slothful putteth his hand in the dish,
And will not so much as bring it to his mouth (xix. 24).

SHREW WOMEN

There are many character sketches of women scattered through the book, some of them summed up in a couplet, others developed more at length. There is the quarrelsome woman, represented as an unbearable bore with whom it is impossible to live:

It is better to sit in a corner of the housetop
Than with a brawling woman and in a common house (xxi. 9).

The common house would perhaps be better expressed as a wide, spacious house, and the parallelism would thus be better maintained. However, the wise man does not consider a little hut on the flat roofs of the Eastern houses a sufficiently safe retreat from the woman's tongue, because he has another proverb:

It is better to dwell in a wilderness
Than with a quarrelsome and passionate woman (xxi. 19).

Here the remedy is indeed drastic. Not all men are equal even to the milder escape of the housetop, and so patience—that is, suffer-

ing—is the only remedy. This suffering is compared to something which is very annoying, namely, rain continually dropping through a leaky roof on a cold day:

A foolish son is the grief of his father
And a wrangling wife is like a roof continually dropping through
(xix. 13).

Roofs dropping through on a cold day
And a contentious woman are alike.
He that retaineth her is as he that would hold the wind,
And shall call in the oil of his right hand (xxvii. 15-16).

It would look from this latter couplet that there is no remedy against the brawling woman, but, as is evident, the proverb is very obscure, and what it really means can only be guessed at. It is impossible to hold or hide the wind, and whatever "calling in the oil of the right hand" may mean, it is clear from the parallelism that it is meant to express something equally futile. A recent author* with very slight emendations in the Hebrew text has got the following sense:

The north wind storeth up the rain,
But a south wind inviteth fruitfulness;

and he concludes: "Thus the remedy against the contentious woman is gentleness." The reconstruction of the Hebrew text in this instance is very plausible and at the same time well founded. However, the proverb as reconstructed would seem to have very little connection with the contentious woman. Let us suppose there is a connection: what are we to think of the conclusion, that the remedy against the contentious woman is gentleness? The truth of this conclusion is evident, for either gentleness will tame the shrew, or—and this is more likely—it will acquire for the gentle person a perfect patience. Cassian will be our authority for the latter alternative. He relates in his Eighteenth Conference (Chapter XIV) that a holy woman of Alexandria wanted to acquire patience, and obtained from St. Athanasius a widow to care for. The widow, however, showed herself so grateful for the care she received, that she was continually honoring and thanking her benefactress. As there was not much opportunity here for the exercise

* Melville Scott, "Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms and Isaiah."

of patience, the holy woman returned to Athanasius to complain that she had been ill served, and begged for someone who would be a real trial to her patience. There was no difficulty in finding among the widows the veriest of shrews, who was given into the charge of the candidate for patience. Athanasius had chosen well this time. The second widow never ceased reproaching, reviling and calumniating her new mistress. In her outbursts she even struck her. To all this the mistress opposed nothing but sweetness, gentleness, patience and forbearance. She made no effort to resist the temper of her charge; she submitted to it. Her aim was not to tame the shrew, but to tame herself. And she succeeded. She became possessed of an unalterable patience, superior to all assaults, and she returned to Athanasius to thank him most sincerely for the wise choice he had made.

PROCEDURAL LAW OF THE CHURCH

By STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Introduction of the Trial in Civil Cases

THE BILL OF COMPLAINT

To open a suit, the plaintiff must present to the competent judge a bill of complaint in which the object of the controversy is exposed, and the service of the judge is implored for the obtaining of the rights which he claims (Canon 1706).

The first thing that a plaintiff has to do is to ascertain whether he has a right of action sustained in Canon Law. Every legal right or claim gives the plaintiff a right of action in the ecclesiastical courts to enforce his right. It must be remembered, however, that the Canon Law may have some exception to the general principle just laid down. One of the most practical exceptions is the one which rules that no court action properly so called is granted against the administrative acts of local Ordinaries by which one thinks oneself unduly oppressed, injured, etc. The law provides another means of redress in those cases by granting recourse to the Holy See, provided the subject in the meantime obeys and submits to the precepts of his Ordinary. After a plaintiff has ascertained that he has a right of action, he must next inquire what court is competent to judge his case. Canons 1556-1568 deal with the competent forum or court. Finally, the plaintiff must put his complaint in writing and specify the facts on which he bases his claim against another person or corporation. More details concerning the bill of complaint are given in the following Canons.

If the plaintiff does not know how to write, or is legitimately impeded from presenting a written complaint, he may make an oral petition in court.

Likewise, in cases which are easier to investigate and which are of minor importance, and therefore to be decided without delay, it is left to the discretion of the judge whether he wishes to accept an oral petition.

In both cases, however, the judge shall order a notary to take

down the complaint in writing, which document is to be read to the plaintiff and approved by him (Canon 1707).

The reader will notice from the text of the foregoing Canon that the law of the Church does not oblige a plaintiff to go to the expense of having someone else draw up his complaint or petition in writing; if he himself does not know how to write, his oral petition in court is admitted. Besides ignorance of the art of writing, other reasons which may prevent the plaintiff from putting his petition in writing are admitted so as to permit him to make an oral petition. Furthermore, in cases which are easy to settle and in cases which are of minor importance, the judge has discretionary power to admit oral petitions. However, in all cases in which a petition is made orally, the judge shall order a notary to put the petition in writing, read it to the plaintiff, and get his approval. The nature of litigation in court demands that the judge and the adverse party know exactly what the plaintiff wants and the written record stops the plaintiff from changing or modifying his claim in the course of the trial.

FORMALITIES OF THE BILL OF COMPLAINT

The bill of complaint (*libellum litis*) by which the case is brought to court must contain the following points:

(1) it must state the name of the judge before whom the case is brought, the object of the petition, and the name of the defendant;

(2) it must indicate, at least in general, the arguments on which the plaintiff relies to prove his allegations and his title to redress;

(3) it must be subscribed by the plaintiff or his proxy, give the day, month and year, the place of residence of the plaintiff or his proxy, or an address at which the plaintiff or his proxy wish to receive communications from the court (Canon 1708).

Ordinarily the law requires the plaintiff to write the petition or have it drawn up by a proxy. If the oral petition is admitted, the notary of the court will see that the petition is put in proper written form. Canon Law calls the bill of complaint or petition "*libellum litis*" (brief of controversy), which term is taken from the Roman Law. In the United States where the Common Law is in vogue the bill of complaint is called a "declaration"; in the States that have

a Code of Law it is called "complaint," and in a few States "petition."

Besides the formal parts of the bill of complaint (name of the judge or court, name of plaintiff and defendant with the necessary items of identification of both, residence where the court may reach both plaintiff and defendant, date and subscription by plaintiff or his representative), the recital of the facts and the reasons in law on which the plaintiff bases his claim should be given in the petition of the plaintiff. The facts should be stated briefly and in good order, and the claim or thing that the plaintiff asks of the court must be stated clearly and unmistakably lest the court reject the petition for reason of its vagueness. All contradictions, obscurities, uncertainties, and equivocation must be avoided in the recital of the facts. Canon Law moreover demands that the plaintiff indicate in general terms at least the principle of law under which he claims some right, property, etc. If the principle of law under which he makes his claim is embodied in the common law of the Church, it suffices to refer briefly to it; if it is a claim which has its foundation in the special law (*e.g.*, of some Religious Order or some private privilege), it will be necessary to show in the bill of complaint the text of the special law or privilege, for the judge is presumed to know the common law and the particular law of the country and diocese, but he is not supposed to know special laws and privileges. If he is to judge from the bill of complaint whether the plaintiff has a right of action, and if that right is based on special law or privilege, it is evident that these special titles of right must be clearly set forth by the plaintiff in his petition.

OBLIGATION OF THE JUDGE AFTER PRESENTATION OF THE BILL OF COMPLAINT

After investigating its own competency and the right of the plaintiff to act as plaintiff in ecclesiastical courts, the court (or judge) must as soon as possible either admit or reject the bill of complaint, and in case of rejection give the reasons for so doing.

If the decree of the judge rejecting the complaint bases its refusal on faults of the complaint which can be amended, the plaintiff can offer to the same judge a properly amended bill of complaint; if

the judge rejects the amended bill of complaint, he must explain the reasons for the new refusal.

Against the rejection of the bill of complaint, the party is at liberty to have recourse to the higher court within ten days. The higher court shall give a hearing to the party and the diocesan prosecutor (or the *defensor vinculi* in a marriage case), and shall hand down a prompt ruling on the question of rejection (Canon 1709).

The first thing that the judge does when he receives a bill of complaint is to consider whether he is according to law competent to try the case. The next point that he has to consider is whether the plaintiff has a right to act as plaintiff in the ecclesiastical court, for the law excludes certain persons from acting as plaintiffs in ecclesiastical courts. The general rules on this point are contained in Canons 1646-1654; the special rules for matrimonial cases are stated in Canons 1971-1973. There is also the declaration of the Holy See that non-Catholics may not be plaintiffs in ecclesiastical courts in marriage cases (Holy Office, January 27, 1928; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XX, 75).

After he has ascertained his own jurisdiction in the case and the right of the plaintiff to bring suit, the judge must as soon as possible issue a declaration whether he admits or rejects the bill of complaint. If he rejects it, he must state his reasons for doing so. The rejection may be based: (1) on faults in the form of the petition; (2) on the substance of the petition or complaint. If there is question of faulty form, the plaintiff must be directed to amend the petition, and, if he does not know how, he must seek advice from persons acquainted with the legal forms in ecclesiastical courts. However, the court itself need not help him to make a correct complaint, at least not in purely private affairs; in affairs that concern the public welfare (*e.g.*, validity of marriage), the court itself is interested and will see to it that the case is properly put before it. Even in private cases, when a person is so poor that he cannot pay an expert for services, the court has the authority and the duty to appoint an attorney of the diocese to assist the plaintiff gratuitously; otherwise a poor person might be altogether prevented from suing for his rights. If the judge rejects the complaint because in his judgment the plaintiff has no cause of action, the matter need not rest there.

The plaintiff has the right within ten days from the notification of the rejection of his complaint to have recourse to the higher court (from the diocesan court to that of the archdiocese, from the archdiocese to the local Ordinary's court which once for all has been chosen by the archdiocese as a court of appeal). The higher court is to give a hearing to the plaintiff, and is to consult the diocesan prosecutor (or, in marriage cases, the *defensor vinculi*) to decide whether the case of the plaintiff is to be admitted to trial. If the higher court also rejects the complaint of the plaintiff for the reason that he has no legal course of action, the Code of Canon Law does not speak of any further recourse open to the plaintiff; the rejection is practically final. The complainant may, of course, appeal to the Holy See (for all the faithful may turn to the Pope as to the common father of the Christian family), but after two courts have decided that the plaintiff has no case, there is little reason to expect the Holy See to judge otherwise. The ten days granted for recourse to the higher court after the first court has rejected the bill of complaint are called *tempus utile* in the Code, by which is meant that the time does not count during which the plaintiff was ignorant of his right of recourse or was unable to act.

NEGLECT OF THE COURT TO ACT ON THE BILL OF COMPLAINT

If, within one month from the presentation of the bill of complaint, the judge has not issued his decree admitting or rejecting the same (as stated in Canon 1709), the party interested may insist that the judge issue the decree. If the judge is nevertheless silent, the party may, on the lapse of five days after his petition to the judge to take action, have recourse to the local Ordinary (if he does not act as judge in the case) or to the higher court to petition that the judge be forced to take action, or that another be appointed in his place to try the case (Canon 1710).

When a bill of complaint is sent to the diocesan court, the judge is bound to give an answer within a month whether the bill is accepted or rejected. The month is called *tempus continuum* to indicate that the month has to be taken absolutely as a period of thirty days, no additional time being allowed for any reason. It is understood that, if the judge (*Officialis*) of the diocese is sick or absent,

the Ordinary shall either act as judge himself or appoint another in the place of the diocesan judge. If no answer to the bill of complaint comes within five days after the second request, the plaintiff has the right to have recourse to the higher court in order that this court may force the lower court to take action in the case. If the local Ordinary of the first court does not act as judge, recourse may be taken by the plaintiff to the Ordinary that he force his *Officialis* to act in the matter. Some canonists are of the opinion that, if the Ordinary acts as judge and is neglectful in giving an answer to a bill of complaint within the specified time, the bishop should be reported to the Holy See. However, such an interpretation of Canon 1710 is not correct, for nothing is said here about recourse to the Holy See, and Canon 1625, §1, which speaks of reporting the bishop to the Holy See deals with an entirely different question as can be seen from the text of that Canon.

THE SUMMONS AND NOTIFICATION OF JUDICIAL ACTS

The bill of complaint or the oral petition having been admitted, the other party must be summoned to appear in court. The summons issued by a court to the defendant is called the *vocatio in ius*. If the contending parties appear before the judge of their own accord to plead their case, it is not necessary to issue the summons, but the secretary or clerk of the court shall make a note in the acts of the case that the parties came to court of their own accord (Canon 1711).

The summons to the defendant or his voluntary appearance in court opens the lawsuit. In the ordinary course of events, the defendant does not go to court of his own accord, for in most cases he would not even know that somebody has gone to court against him. The summons is therefore the usual way in which a defendant gets into court. Wherefore, the following Canons go into detail concerning the form of the summons.

PERSONS TO WHOM THE SUMMONS IS TO BE ISSUED

The summons is to be issued by the judge, and is to be written on the bill of complaint or joined to it. It is to be communicated

to the defendant, and, if there are several defendants, to each one. The plaintiff, moreover, must be notified by the court to appear on a specified day and at a fixed hour before the judge (Canon 1712).

If the defendant is a person who does not have the free administration of the goods concerned in the controversy, the summons must be presented to that person who in his name is, according to Canons 1648-1654, to answer in the trial (Canon 1713).

The order of the court to the defendant to appear on a certain day and hour in the place specified for the sessions of the court is very often the first intimation that someone is suing the defendant. The law, therefore, justly ordains that the order of the court should be either written on the bill of complaint or a copy of the petition of the plaintiff should accompany the summons, so that the defendant may know who sues him, what he wants, and why he claims to have a right to get what he demands. If there are several defendants, the court has to issue the summons to every one of them, as is evident, for each defendant has the same right to the official notice. The plaintiff is to be notified by the court to appear on a certain day and at a certain hour (namely, the same time as the defendant), in order that the discussion or trial of the case may be started. As a rule, the parties do not have to appear in person, and may send a representative to court.

As it is important that the proper party be made defendant to a suit, the plaintiff must make certain that he names and identifies the person against whom he has a claim, and who has a right to defend himself against the plaintiff. Now, in Canon Law as well as in civil law, there are persons who possess goods and rights but do not have independent administration of them (*e.g.*, minors, men in charge of ecclesiastical corporations). The person responsible in court for another person or corporation must be summoned.

EFFECT OF THE SUMMONS

Every summons is peremptory, and need not be repeated, except in the case mentioned in Canon 1845, §2—namely, when the judge wants to punish for contempt of court a party who ignores the first summons (Canon 1714). No delay is granted for any reason in answering the summons, because if the defendant is impeded from

appearing in court by ill-health, business, etc., he can send another person in his place.

CONTENTS OF THE SUMMONS

The summons is to be presented to the party in a written form, which shall express the precept of the judge to the party to appear in his court. It shall state the name of the judge who issues the paper, indicate at least in general terms the reason why the party is summoned, give the correct name and surname of the defendant, and state by whom he is sued; the place and time where and when he is to appear must be clearly indicated. The summons is to be authenticated with the seal of the court and subscribed by the judge or his auditor and a notary (Canon 1715).

The summons is to be made in duplicate, one copy being presented to the defendant and the other inserted into the acts of the case (Canon 1716).

MANNER OF SERVICE OF THE SUMMONS

The written summons is to be handed to the defendant personally by a messenger of the Curia wheresoever he finds him, if this manner of serving the summons is possible. The messenger may for this purpose enter the territory of another diocese, if the judge thinks it advisable and orders the messenger to do so.

If the messenger does not find the person to be summoned in the place where he stays, he may leave the written summons with some person of the family or with a servant of the defendant, if that person is willing to accept the summons and promises to give it to the defendant as soon as possible; otherwise, the messenger shall take it back to the judge in order that he may dispatch it in the manner provided in Canons 1719 and 1720 (Canon 1717).

If the defendant refuses to accept the written summons, he is to be considered legitimately summoned (Canon 1718).

If for reason of distance or other cause it is difficult to have the summons delivered to the defendant by messenger, the judge may order it to be transmitted by registered mail and a signed receipt obtained, or in any other manner which according to the laws and

conditions of the respective country is considered safest (Canon 1719).

Whenever after diligent inquiry it cannot be ascertained where the defendant stays, the summons by edict or public announcement can take place. This is done by having the messenger post the document of the summons at the doors of the Curia after the manner of a public notice (which is to be left there for a length of time to be specified by the judge), and by inserting the summons in some public newspaper. If both cannot be done, either manner of public notice suffices (Canon 1720).

REPORT OF THE MESSENGER TO THE COURT

When the messenger leaves the written summons in the hands of the defendant, he must sign it, marking the date and the hour at which he handed it to the defendant. He shall act in the same manner when he leaves the summons with a member of the family or ■ servant of the defendant, adding also the name of the person with whom he leaves the summons. If the summons is made by public edict, the messenger shall at the bottom of the notice mark the day and hour at which he posted the paper at the door of the Curia and how long it remained posted. If the defendant refuses to accept the summons offered to him by the messenger, the latter shall mark the day and hour, sign the summons and return it to the judge (Canon 1721).

The messenger shall make a written report to the judge of his work in the serving of the summons, and add his signature to the report, which is to be inserted in the acts of the case. If the summons was served by mail, the receipt of the post office shall be inserted in the acts (Canon 1722).

Though the Code does not mention the transmission of the summons to the Curia of another diocese (if the defendant actually stays there), with the request that it be served on the defendant, or its transmission to the pastor of the parish of the diocese of the court with orders to serve it on the defendant, Wernz-Vidal think (*De Processibus*, n. 390) that this method is not condemned by the law, and may be employed where the ordinary way of serving the summons is not practical. The Curia of the other diocese (or

the pastor of the parish) will then do what the messenger is obliged to do in serving the summons and making report to the court that issued it.

VALIDITY OF THE SUMMONS NECESSARY FOR VALIDITY OF THE PROCESS

If the summons does not contain the points enumerated in Canon 1715, or was not legitimately served, both the summons and the acts of the process are null and void (Canon 1723).

What is required to be stated in the summons we have seen in the discussion on Canon 1715. Besides those points, it is necessary for the validity of the process that the summons be served on the defendant as prescribed in Canons 1717-1721. One of the important points in the summons is that the name of the defendant be specifically mentioned. Thus, for instance, it does not suffice to summon the editors of a periodical without specifically mentioning each person summoned, for the Sacred Roman Rota declared a summons to the editors null and void, because not directed to a specified person or persons (cfr. Roman Rota, May 15, 1913; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, V, 286). If the suit is against a legal ecclesiastical person (community, parish, etc.), the summoning of the administrators or directors generally suffices (Roman Rota, May 15, 1913; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, V, 285). If the precise time when the person is to appear is not stated in the summons, it is invalid; but, if the person nevertheless appears in court, the process is valid (Roman Rota, July 13, 1918; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XI, 395).

COURT SUMMONS FOR VARIOUS JUDICIAL ACTS

The rules stated above for the summoning of the defendant shall be observed also in the other judicial acts, after they have been adapted to the diverse nature of the acts—for example, in notifying the parties concerned of the orders and sentences of the judge, in summoning witness, and the like (Canon 1724).

VARIOUS LEGAL CONSEQUENCES FOLLOWING FROM THE SUMMONS

When the defendant has been legitimately summoned, or the parties have to their own accord appear in court, such act has the following effects:

(1) the case ceases to be a *res integra* (that is, the case is before the court, and the matter is no longer a private affair between the parties concerned);

(2) the case becomes proper to the judge or the court wherein the action has begun. If, therefore, the plaintiff had a choice between the courts of two or three different dioceses, supposing that all were competent to try the case, the issuance of the summons puts the case into the hands of the court which issued them, and excludes all other courts from trying the case in the first instance;

(3) the jurisdiction of a delegated judge is rendered firm, so that it does not expire with the loss of jurisdiction of the one who delegated him;

(4) prescription is interrupted, because from the moment property or rights are made a subject of litigation, the good faith essential to prescription ceases;

(5) the case begins to be pending, wherefore immediately the principle of Canon Law applies that pending the litigation nothing may be changed—*i.e.* concerning the subject of the litigation or any act on the part of the plaintiff or defendant or others at the parties' request or consent that may be prejudicial to either plaintiff or defendant (Canon 1725).

LITURGICAL NOTES

By THE BENEDICTINE MONKS OF BUCKFAST ABBEY

XI. The Nativity of Our Blessed Lady

I. MARY'S BIRTHDAY A DAY OF JOY

The radiant figure of the majestic Queen of the Universe ever stands before the children of the Catholic Church. The Liturgy takes good care that we do not forget or overlook her. We are made to turn to her and to raise our voice to her at the conclusion of every one of the Canonical Hours. The ecclesiastical year is studded with festivals in her honor, feasts that show her in all manner of—shall I say?—guises, in which her manifold privileges and graces are exhibited before us for our joy and admiration, very much as a jeweller might show one trinket after another just to give proof of his skill or to dazzle us by the splendor of gem and precious stone.

The feasts of Our Lady naturally fall into two classes—first, there are the major solemnities, such as her Immaculate Conception or her Assumption into Heaven; and there are the lesser feasts, among which we must rank her Nativity and the Visitation. There are not a few devout clients of Mary who experience a peculiar happiness in the celebration of those less solemn days, for they seem more intimate and familiar and to bring the Blessed Mother of Our Lord nearer to us. Her sinless conception, her divine motherhood, her glorious triumph are events of such stupendous magnitude that we can only think of them with wonder and awe. Not that these twin sentiments necessarily exclude joy for ourselves and joy in the glory of Our Lady—far from it. But there is an element of sweet, gentle humanity in Mary's birth or in her kindly visit to her relative that makes a deep appeal to our heart, precisely because in these incidents, not to speak of the many others that could be mentioned, Our Lady is exceedingly near to ourselves and is seen on the common plane of our own humanity.

The Litany of Loreto is not a liturgical prayer in the strictest sense of the word, but it is at least what we may call one of the

semi-official expressions of the Church's attitude towards Mary and of what she thinks and knows of her position in the scheme of the Redemption. Now in this sublime prayer Mary is styled *Causa nostræ lætitiæ*. Yes, Mary is a cause of joy. She is a joy-giver, for she brought into the world the incarnate, personal Joy of God—even Him of whom a Voice from heaven said: "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased" (Matt., xvii. 1). And she is even now carrying on her blessed task of a joy-giver. Not to speak here of her gracious ministry as the *Mediatrix omnium gratiarum* (which is, I suppose, but another presentment of the truth of her universal intercession, itself a logical sequel of that universal motherhood upon which she entered in an hour of excruciating anguish at the foot of the Cross), surely, whenever the course of the calendar brings round one of her feasts, there is likewise a fresh outpouring of holy joy in the souls of her children. This is particularly true of Mary's Nativity. Again and again in the antiphons and responsories of the Office reference is made to the joy that this blessed birth brought to the whole world: *Nativitas tua . . . gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo*.

It could scarcely be otherwise when we think of what the birth of this child of benediction meant to mankind. All the children of Eve are born in the anguish of their mothers. "In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children," it was said to the mother of the human race (Gen., iii. 16). It is hardly credible that the bringing forth of her blessed child should have been a cause of physical anguish to Mary's holy mother, for assuredly that holy woman must have had an inkling of some unique destiny for the child of her old age. Mary's birth was holy Ann's supreme hour, the highest peak of her existence. We may assume that, even as in this conception all was sinless and unspotted, so in this birth all was not only painless but was, on the contrary, the occasion for an outburst of spiritual gladness. The long, weary centuries of longing and waiting were drawing to their appointed close. The Saviour was now not far off since His Mother had appeared. Mary's birth is like the bright dawn on a summer's morning—a vision that cheers the heart because of the rich promise of golden hours, for presently the sun must appear above the eastern hills since, by an ineluctable link of cause and

effect, the snowy tints of the sky at dawn are the harbingers of the full day.

II. THREE BIRTHDAYS CELEBRATED BY THE CHURCH

The Church is very shy of birthday celebrations. As St. Augustine pointed out already in his time, besides the birth of the Saviour the only other birth she honors with a special solemnity is that of St. John the Baptist. In the other Saints and elect of God she honors the day on which they entered into that everlasting life by comparison with which existence in this world is death; for eternal life—therefore true life—is an experience of God and contact with Him which constitutes the essence of bliss. St. Augustine (*Sermo xx de Sanctis*, cfr. *Rom. Brev.*, Noct. II, 24 June) states the special reason for keeping the birthday of John the Baptist: it was because of his special mission as forerunner, for the Lord wished men not to be taken unawares by His coming, lest His unexpected advent should so bewilder them, or find them so surprised, that they would fail to recognize Him (*quia per hunc Dominus adventum suum, ne subito homines insperatum non agnoscerent, voluit esse testatum*).

No doubt it was no small privilege for the son of the Jewish priest to receive so important and honorable a mission. John was like those messengers who go before some great personage, preparing the way for them, warning people of the great man's approach, bidding them be on the look-out for him. For that reason his birth also was surrounded with so many signs and wonders. Above all, it was the signal for an outburst of joy: *Multi in nativitate ejus gaudebunt*, the Angel said to Zachary as he stood at the corner of the altar where the astonished priest was carrying out the duties of his office. And when the longed-for event took place, it was not merely the house of the priest that rang with the accents of his joyful *Benedictus*, but far and near, over the whole hill-country of Judea, men stood about in groups, talking of the strange happenings at Hebron, and solemnly shaking their heads they asked of one another: "What is the meaning of all this? What is that boy going to be, for already at the first hour of his coming into the world the hand of the Lord is seen exerting itself on his behalf?"

By reason of his office as herald of Christ, John is not only sanctified from his mother's womb, but he is also filled with a measure

of grace that puts him in a category by himself. All that we could say of him—and infinitely more—has been expressed by Incarnate Truth itself: *Inter natos mulierum non surrexit major*—though the words do not necessarily compel us to believe that the forerunner stands on a higher level, in God's kingdom, than he who was selected for an office which, assuredly, was at least as sacred as that of the Baptist. The point to retain is that John's birth is kept as a solemn day because of the holiness of his life and the unique dignity of his mission as the forerunner. Now, it surely follows that, if there is indeed every reason for honoring the nativity of such a man, there exists an incomparably stronger reason for honoring the birth of one who was destined and prepared in the eternal designs of Providence for a relationship with the Eternal Word than which it is impossible to conceive one greater, holier and especially more intimate, for it was out of the living substance of Mary's virginal flesh and blood that the Holy Ghost was to form a body for God's own Son. We cannot conceive any bond or tie between two beings as close as those obtaining between a mother and her child, for the child is formed of the very substance of its mother and its very character is moulded and influenced by the character and dispositions of the mother.

All Mary's privileges, her position in the supernatural order, her dignity as lady and mistress of Angels and Saints, are accounted for easily and also exclusively by the fact of her divine motherhood. In view of the incomprehensible mystery of divine condescension, wisdom and omnipotence which we call the Incarnation, Mary was created from the first as a being apart: she is indeed human and a creature, but supernaturally or from the point of view of grace and holiness she is a world of her own, something unique, something that has never been before and never will be repeated. The creative word that called her glorious soul into existence is truly a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* in the sense that no soul ever was created or ever will be summoned into existence which could be placed on the same plane as hers. The greeting addressed to her by Gabriel in the silent midnight hour of the Incarnation implies that not only was she never under the baneful influence of sin—while this is wonderful enough by itself, it is after all something negative—but that her soul was enriched with such a wealth of divine gifts that the only

words that could remotely convey an idea of them were those of the Hail Mary: *full of grace*.

III. INSTITUTION OF THE FEAST

Notwithstanding the fact that these privileges of the Mother of Our Lord were not unknown or unheeded by the Christians of the early centuries, the institution of a special feast to mark the day on which so marvellous and indeed so utterly unique a creature came into this world is of a somewhat later date. This need not surprise us, for it is on all fours with the other features of Mariology: in this respect development was very gradual, and we may safely put the date of the first great explosion of enthusiastic praise and public veneration of Mary as that of the Council of Ephesus, the fifteenth centenary of which we commemorate this year. As a matter of fact, it needed all the stormy, long-drawn christological controversies of the fourth century to bring out, as a logical and necessary corollary, the singular dignity of the woman of whose substance the Holy Spirit Himself built the temple of the Eternal Word by a direct intervention which we can adore whilst we shudder with awe and reverence at its incomprehensible sublimity.

We cannot ascertain the exact date of the institution of a feast which was destined to become so dear to Mary's children. Whereas the nativity of St. John the Baptist was already observed in the fourth century, St. Augustine in the fifth, as we have seen, knows nothing of our feast. Its celebration began in the East; at any rate, from a sermon of Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, we learn that in the fifth century Mary's birth was certainly honored, even if there was no feast properly so called. In the West the nativity of Mary was first honored by the Roman Church and the Gelasian and Gregorian sacramentaries bear witness to the fact. We find it observed in other provinces of the West: thus, St. Ildephonsus of Toledo testified for Spain in the seventh century and the Venerable Bede for Great Britain in the eighth. The Pontifical of Egbert of York has a blessing for the Feast of Our Lady's Nativity. St. Peter Damian speaks of our feast as universally established throughout the West. Durandus sees a wonderful gradation in the three Nativities honored by the Church (*Rat. Div. Off.*, VII, 28): John was

twilight, Mary the dawn, Christ the sun—*Joannes fuit lucifer, Maria fuit aurora, nativitas Christi ortus solis.*

On the death of Gregory IX the Cardinals experienced great difficulties in the election of a successor, for those were the days when Frederick II tyrannized over the Church. In order to obtain the assistance of God and of Mary they bound themselves by vow that whichever of their number should be elected would enhance the solemnity of Mary's birthday by an octave. Celestine IV was elected but died within eighteen days, so Innocent IV who succeeded him carried out the vow and instituted the octave.

The Gregorian Sacramentary contains not only the Collects of the Mass and a proper Preface, but likewise the prayers *super populum* before the procession which preceded the Mass. The text of our Mass today is that of the usual Mass of Our Lady except the Epistle and Gospel and such alterations in the text of the usual Preface as adapt it to this special feast. The Epistle is a lengthy piece describing the generation, before all ages, of Eternal Wisdom. Those famous texts, which in their literal sense apply to the Word of God, have long been applied to our Blessed Lady in *sensu accomodato*, and very properly too, because the eternal decree which ordained that Wisdom should become incarnate also foresaw and included the creation of this masterpiece of divine wisdom and love. The Gospel is the genealogy in St. Matthew's Gospel.

It is recognized that the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, by reason of its very popularity which caused it to be generally accepted, has seen so many additions when adopted all over the Latin Church that it is impossible, in most particular cases, to ascertain whether a piece is from the original Gregorian book or is merely a later and local addition. But the three prayers have that flavor of antiquity which is unmistakable. The Preface is striking: "Vere dignum et justum est. . . . nos tibi in omnium sanctorum tuorum propectu gratias agere, Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus: et præcipue pro meritis beatæ Dei Genitricis et perpetuæ Virginis Mariæ, gratia plenæ, tuam omnipotentiam laudare, benedicere et prædicare. Per quem. . . ."

Mary's Nativity is one of her dearest feasts. Her coming into the world was what spring is to the whole year. Who can tell the joy this child of benediction brought into the holy household that

was privileged to claim her for its own? All the hopes of humanity were centered on that child. The Angels formed a guard of honor round her who was destined to be their lady and queen. From that blessed hour God Himself looked down upon this earth with untold love and complacency, for a great light had been lit in the universal gloom and the fragrance of a flower of exquisite purity rose up even to the throne of the Most High. So it is not to be wondered at that Holy Church insists so much upon this note of joy and gladness. We have it on Christ's authority that a woman, when she has brought forth her child, forgets her travail because of her joy that a man is born into the world. Today there is born into the world one whose coming has been awaited with a longing only second in its intensity to that with which the Patriarchs of old sighed for the birth of her Divine Child: *Nativitas tua, Dei Genitrix Virgo, gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo. . . . Cum jucunditate nativitatem beatæ Mariæ celebremus.*

THE HOSPITAL CHAPLAIN

By WILLIAM SCHAEFERS

I

Among the various posts of duty to which priests are assigned by their bishops—pastor of a parish, superintendent of diocesan schools, director of the Propagation of the Faith, editor of the diocesan paper, manager of diocesan charities, member of the diocesan teaching faculty, head of the Holy Name Society, prefect of the Holy Childhood Association, member of a Diocesan Mission Band—that of a chaplaincy seems to rank the lowest. Ordinarily, a chaplaincy is considered an appointment that carries with it little or no prestige, a minimum of responsibilities, and a lack of opportunity for creative work. In times gone by, a priest unfit for parish work was usually the logical choice to fill a vacant chaplaincy, nor have the times changed greatly in this respect. The chaplain is still a sort of an inconsequential member of the diocesan clergy; he is the priest who has grasped but missed his goal. A chaplaincy is still the place for the old, the feeble, the untalented, the physical wreck; once chained to it, the occupant passes quickly out of the picture. He is done for; the gates are closed to him.

The poor chaplain! When he approaches a group of diocesan pastors, amongst whom are those who rule over big, thriving, up-and-doing parishes, a feeling of insignificance seizes him. Frequently he is greeted by a jolly chorus of: "Here comes the chaplain." In vain he fumbles for a reply. He stands in the midst of men of many and great affairs, who, just because it is more or less the custom of the day, indulge in clever patter, magnifying the ease, comfort, leisure, and irresponsibilities of a chaplaincy. Poor fellow, he is peppered with such remarks as: "Lucky chap, no pew rent to collect!" "Fortunate man, no parish school to build!" "A sinecure, boy!" "No parish debts to wrestle with!" And so on and so forth. The chaplain is smothered with congratulations. But—it's a trick the pastors have, and the chaplain knows it, feels it. For back of all this gay talk and unsolicited congratulations bulges the eternal truth: the pastors are all glad that they are pastors and not chaplains! If put to

it, every pastor in the group would express himself on the matter in the plainest words: "I would rather have any old parish than a chaplaincy." The chaplain knows that; he has heard such expressions before. And thus does the lowliness of his position overwhelm him. The inconsequential importance of a chaplaincy rises up to torture and torment his soul: if only he were a pastor, he would do things, draw the attention perhaps of his bishop, and compete with the achievements of his brother-priests! But alas, he is only a chaplain. The realization of this misfortune whips him.

II

But why all this? Why should the importance of a chaplaincy be so underestimated? Why take the attitude that a chaplaincy is only for the ambitionless, for the numbskulls and for the burnt-out, and the pastoral field only for the Cæsars? Why should the chaplain droop his head and meekly allow himself to be whittled down to nothing? There is no reason for all that. Consider the wide field, flecked with a thousand spiritual cares, responsibilities, opportunities: chaplaincies at convents, academies, universities, hospitals, army barracks, and countless charitable institutions; chaplaincies which involve a priestly work reaching classified groups of people in specific stages of life—religious aspirants, students, soldiers, the sick and the dying, the friendless and the homeless, the poor and the helpless. A rather important element of our Catholic population comes under the care of chaplains.

III

One-third of the chaplains are busy instructing novices, students, soldiers, orphan children, the deaf and dumb, etc.; one-third of the chaplains are busy encouraging and ministering to those threatened in the midst of life by the ever-grasping finger of sickness, disease, epidemic, accident, and death; and the balance of the chaplains are busy in giving sympathy, advice, and support to those who have seen life and been wrecked by it—the aged, the feeble, the disillusioned, the prisoners, the homeless and the helpless.

Confining myself strictly to hospital chaplains, because they are the most numerous and their work the most trying, I wish to point out the great importance of the vast field in which they labor. A

glance at the following statistics will give the reader some idea of the bigness of the hospital field:*

BEDS	In all Hospitals 892,943	In Cath. Hospitals 85,803	Percentage Cath. Beds 9.6
BEDS	In non-Gov. Hospitals 325,000	In Cath. Hospitals 85,803	Percentage Cath. Beds 26.4
BEDS	In all Sectarian Hospitals 114,615	In Cath. Hospitals 85,803	Percentage Cath. Beds 74.8
Registered Hospitals	In the U. S. 6,852	Cath. Hospitals 655	Percentage Cath. Hospitals 9.5
Hospital Chaplains	Resident Chaplains 393	Non-resident Chaplains 262	

Our Catholic hospitals serve between 2,750,000 and 3,000,000 patients annually, in-patients and out-patients. The deaths total 40,000 to 60,000 annually. Among the several millions of patients served annually in our hospitals are thousands upon thousands of Catholic patients. The majority of these Catholic patients come under the spiritual care of the hospital chaplain when under greatest stress—fighting for life, delaying death or meeting it, or struggling for health. Every day brings its many problems to the chaplain. Fallen-away Catholics must be brought to the point where they will have the courage and good sense to pick up the discarded faith; marriages must be rectified, validated; sick bed and death bed confessions reveal a thousand woes and wrongs and sins that must be attended to with dispatch and satisfaction; dispensations and extraordinary faculties must be applied for. The hospital is no paradise. It is an institution where extremes meet every hour of the day and night. Here every beat of the heart and every physical effort of the patient is launched with the hope that health will be regained—health, that

* Statistics given by the Catholic Hospital Association of the United States and Canada (headquarters at St. Louis, Mo.).

will-o'-the-wisp which millions of people chase with untiring and unspeakable stubbornness. The hospital is a battlefield, the habitat of birth and death, the restorer of health, the mender of broken limbs; it is one of God's busiest workshops. Here He works through human agencies. Here, at the psychological moment, very often is brought home the thrust that will do the patient the most good spiritually. God, we know, exerts a tremendous influence in an institution where death and life contend daily for the mastery, where hope and despair run neck and neck, where pains run wild or are abated, where dulled consciences are aroused and pricked and tormented, as the struggle begins to cheat death and the lonesome grave, if possible.

IV

A hospital chaplain may not have a large congregation. But he has one that needs special care. The daily visiting rounds, the daily Holy Communion to patients, the sharp watch over patients who may drop off suddenly; the confessions, instructions, and Extreme Unctions; the constant search for patients who should be Catholics but who registered as having "no religion"; the duty of trying to bring back fallen-away Catholics into the Church and the lukewarm to some degree of fervor, mending a marriage under stress, overcoming the opposition of meddling relatives and friends, etc.: a real big task is all this. Frequently there is not a moment's time to be lost. The chaplain must get in his licks in a hurry. Time is precious when death hovers near.

A zealous chaplain can do untold good. His work reaches far. He can make converts, beat down bigotry, edify the public. The pastors ought to consider the chaplain as a very important cog in the machine. Think of the subsequent good results of successfully bringing back the fallen-away, arousing the lukewarm, mending broken marriages or validating mixed marriages; such good work concerns the pastors. For on recovering such patients return to their respective parishes far better Catholics than when they left to enter the hospital. Many a Catholic patient's hospital experience has proved to be a sort of a mission to him. It was the time—the right and the ripe time—when he could be brought to his senses.

Consider also what a relief it is to pastors to know that their

sick and dying are in the hands of a zealous chaplain. What a trying thing it is frequently for a pastor to go to a non-Catholic hospital to administer to the spiritual needs of one of his parishioners! He dislikes such an errand. How happy he is when he knows that his parishioners go to a Catholic hospital where there is a chaplain to care for them!

V

The chaplain is by no means the least amongst us. The very nature of his work and the class of his parishioners are quite enough to place him on an equal footing with pastors of parishes. He may not have such responsibilities as collecting money to pay off debts, building churches and schools and rectories, organizing parish societies, etc., but he has the equal, at least, of such responsibilities. His parochial territory is small—the hospital building. But under its roof a population is struggling day in and day out for life and health; there is no end to the struggles waged here, no end to the problems they present. And the chaplain is constantly in the midst of it all, faithfully performing his duties. He is holding down a hard job and an important one. If the nature of his duties were better understood, their importance would be better appreciated.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

THE SANATIO IN RADICE: ITS USE AND ABUSE

Question: We read many a time and oft in periodicals such as THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW that neither the Pope nor any bishop can give dispensation for the marriage of a Catholic to a non-Catholic unless the required promises are made. We find, however, that when a non-Catholic absolutely refuses to make the promises and the Catholic caring little for the will of God and of His Church marries outside the Church, the Catholic party simply requests a *sanatio in radice* to validate the marriage, and then frequently pretends to be a fervent Catholic. Now, if the promises are by the divine law necessary for a licit union between a Catholic and a non-Catholic, and the *sanatio in radice* is granted to validate the union without ever approaching the non-Catholic (granting it even in cases where it is known that the bigoted non-Catholic is so much opposed to the Catholic Church that he would have no marriage with the Catholic if the priest or the Church has anything to do with it), how can such a validation be granted? Is it not inviting the Catholic to marry a non-Catholic outside the Church because he finds it easier to get a *sanatio* than a dispensation?

Two cases recently struck your correspondent as peculiar. A girl married outside the Church twelve years ago and remained outside it until the shadows of death began to creep upon her. She had six children brought up outside the Church. She called for a priest when dangerously ill. A reconciliation with the Church was sought in revalidating the marriage. The husband agreed to go through the form required but refused to sign the promises. The pastor refused to revalidate the marriage without the promises as instructed by the bishop. However, at the last moment she received the Sacraments, died and was buried in consecrated ground. On the other hand, a Catholic, though attending church every Sunday, did not frequent the Sacraments for twelve years, died suddenly and was buried outside the Church and consecrated ground. The married woman laughed at the Church for twelve years, and brought up six others to laugh at her; yet, she seemed to fare better than the one who had been far less wicked. How do these things square with Catholic theology?

SUBSCRIBER.

Answer: There is no doubt that the divine law forbids a Catholic to endanger his faith and that of his children by marrying a non-Catholic. The Supreme Authority of the Church has frequently inculcated that principle. The promises of the non-Catholic are required for the purpose of doing away with the danger to the faith of the Catholic party and his children. With that principle in view,

it is difficult to understand why the same Supreme Authority of the Church grants the *sanatio in radice* and delegates the bishops to grant it, for in that validation of the marriage the non-Catholic party makes no promise to guarantee the freedom of the Catholic to practise his or her religion, and no provision is made for the Catholic baptism and education of the children; in fact, the non-Catholic does not know that the marriage is validated by the Church. The laxity with which the *sanatio in radice* has been granted, and about which our correspondent complains, has not been in accord with the mind of the Holy See. Nobody would accuse the Supreme Authority of the lack of consistency in her teaching and practice. If she teaches that the removal of the danger of perversion of the Catholic party and the children is demanded by the divine law before a marriage of a Catholic with a non-Catholic can be permitted, she would not validate a mixed marriage by the *sanatio in radice* if the non-Catholic is so much opposed to the Catholic faith that the Catholic is not permitted to live according to his religion and to baptize and bring up the children as Catholics. The recent form of the faculties which the bishops get from the Holy See contains a very important change in the faculty concerning the *sanatio in radice*: it demands that before the marriage is validated there be a fair certainty that the faith of the Catholic and that of the children shall be safeguarded. The priest must, therefore, make every possible effort to have the marriage rectified in the ordinary way by the promises and dispensation and renewal of marriage consent. If the non-Catholic objects to a new marriage ceremony, but is otherwise not opposed to the practice of the Catholic faith by the Catholic party and to the baptism and Catholic education of the children, the *sanatio in radice* can be made use of to validate the marriage. To attempt to validate the marriage before the Church when the non-Catholic is so much opposed to the Church that he would not want to marry the Catholic at all if the priest or the Church had anything to do with it, is useless and unprincipled.

Some of the lenient but unprincipled concessions of the *sanatio in radice* have undoubtedly been caused by pity for the terrible plight in which a Catholic finds himself after defying the law of God and of the Church by marrying a non-Catholic outside the Church. Sometimes girls of excellent Catholic families sadden the

heart of father and mother by their marriage outside the Church, and, when those young people realize that they have apostatized from their Church, they also find that they are at the mercy of their non-Catholic partner who during the time of courtship was so wonderfully sweet, the best man in the world, and now as cruel as the devils in hell. This is no exaggeration, but just cold fact as every priest working in the care of souls knows. What can be done for the Catholic in this plight? We ask: What is he (or she) willing to do for himself? He has tied the hands of the Church. It may be a hard road to retrace his steps, but, if people of the world break up marriages for trifling considerations, why can a Catholic not do so to return to his God?

If ever a priest at the hour of death gives the Last Sacraments to a person who has been living in a state of sin, he should bear in mind that there is no conversion to God possible unless a person is willing to break with the state of sin at any cost. It is not good principle to wait until a person is at the very moment of death and then say that he is willing, or would be willing if he could express himself, and give him the Sacraments. The religious sense of God-fearing people is offended by incongruities and inconsistencies in the ministry of the priest.

PRIESTS' RETREAT WITHOUT MASS

Question: Our annual clergy retreat opened June 9, 1930. The following day was Pentecost Tuesday, on which day pastors are obliged to offer up Holy Mass for the people. On that day as well as during the entire retreat no opportunity was afforded the priests to say Mass. In this case, were we obliged to say that Mass later on which we had to omit through no fault of ours?
SACERDOS.

Answer: The rule is that the pastor who is legitimately absent from his parish may either say the Mass for the people himself or have it said by the priest who takes his place in the parish. The priests should have been permitted to say Mass during the retreat, and the obligation of supplying the Masses that should have been said would naturally fall on those who prevented the pastors from saying Mass. It is very strange that there still are priests' retreats without the priests' daily Mass, considering that the Holy See ever since the days of Pope Pius X has been incessantly urging the Catho-

lic people to receive daily Holy Communion. Evidently no other time is more appropriate for the daily Mass of the priest than the days of the annual retreat. The difficulty in providing facilities for the many priests on retreat to say Mass has been responsible for the practice of abstaining from offering the Holy Sacrifice. With proper effort that difficulty can be overcome. If the number of priests is too large, retreats could be arranged for smaller groups, and that would overcome not only the difficulty of providing means for each priest to say Mass daily but also the other inconveniences of distraction, lack of order, etc., incident to the assembly of a large crowd of men.

PROTESTANT MINISTER GIVING INVOCATION OR BENEDICTION IN
PRESENCE OF CATHOLIC PRIEST

Question: Is it permissible for a Catholic priest to give the baccalaureate address at commencement exercises when the invocation and benediction are pronounced by a Protestant minister? When the priest himself gives the invocation and benediction, there should be no objection, for then he is not obliged to take part in the prayer offered by the minister. If the priest would not rise with the audience when the invocation or benediction is given by the minister, perhaps this would offset the impression that the priest is one in faith and prayer with the minister.

READER.

Answer: Peace and harmony among all men of good will is important in our towns and cities where there are many different Christian denominations. The priest should not keep aloof from the non-Catholics, for the Church wants him to take an interest in the welfare of their souls (cfr. Canon 1350, §1), and how could he have an influence upon them if he avoids all occasions to get acquainted with them? The priest who does seek contact with Protestant ministers and people must be a student, a man with the kindness of Christ and spiritual tact and prudence, a man of patience and indulgence who is willing to concede that people may be wrong objectively but absolutely sincere in their subjective convictions, who will bear with the embarrassment and discomfort that such differences between him and those of other convictions cause, will keep that suffering of soul to himself and will not quarrel or contend with anyone, and who only when absolutely necessary will state with mildness and firmness that his contrary religious principles do not

permit him to agree with them. If a priest in his whole life and conduct is a true representative of Christ in his community, those of other religions who get to know him will respect him, though according to their religious convictions they cannot agree with him. As to his presence at commencement exercises and the minister's invocation and benediction on such occasions, we do not think that there is anything against our principles of faith in his rising and paying respect to the prayer pronounced, for he is not taking part in an official Protestant religious service and he is not compromising his faith in any way, and people cannot reasonably say or think that he is.

EARLY FIRST COMMUNION AND DIFFICULTY OF GETTING THE CHILDREN FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTION

Question: The law of the Church wants the children to be prepared for first Holy Communion at the age of seven, and experience proves that Holy Communion at that early age does help the children to keep their souls free from sin. There is, however, a great difficulty met with in many parishes which have no Catholic school, namely, that the parents stop sending their children to Catechism instructions once they have been admitted to first Holy Communion. For this reason some pastors do not admit the children to first Holy Communion until they are eleven or twelve years of age. Can any one give advice what to do to carry out the law of the Church and still keep the children in Catechism classes?

PAROCHUS.

Answer: The practical answer to this pastoral problem may be as varied as the circumstances of the various parishes that have no parochial school. In some parishes the appeal of the pastor to the conscience of the parents may bring fruit. Why it does not in all parishes is impossible to determine, unless the parents of the children are so ignorant in matters of religion that they cannot be made to understand the necessity of a thorough instruction of the children. Judging from the various reports we have received from correspondents concerning this difficulty, it seems certain that with the best effort the pastor cannot make an impression on the parents. Possibly there is a way out of the difficulty if the Catechism class could be made so attractive to the children that they would be anxious to attend. If the children want to go, they will in most cases get their way. We realize that it is not an easy matter to make school attrac-

tive to every child, if it is to be school and not play. Some material benefit would naturally attract better than all the kindness and affection of the priest or other teacher. Many children dislike school, no matter how good and kind the teacher is. We do not think that we would have very regular attendance at any school if it was left entirely to the good will of the children to attend or to stay away. If the pastor cannot get the children to attend Catechism once they have received first Holy Communion at the age of seven or thereabouts, it is certainly better to keep them waiting for first Holy Communion until they are fairly well instructed in their religion, for without some foundation of their faith they will not keep up the practice of religion as they are growing into manhood or womanhood.

POVERTY OF A PARISH AS AN EXCUSE FOR USING OTHER THAN BEESWAX CANDLES

Question: A pastor who was rebuked by a fellow-priest for using paraffin candles only at the Mass answered that the church was too poor to buy wax candles. The best he could do was to get candles at the dime store. The visiting priest refused to say Mass with those candles. Does the Church admit poverty of a parish as an excuse from using beeswax candles at Mass?

SUBSCRIBER.

Answer: The Church demands beeswax candles and does not ordinarily consider that it is an unusual hardship to have two candles lighted at a Low Mass, since the wax consumed costs only a few cents. Even the few cents a day make dollars in a year, and from the accounts of men who have worked in the poorest sections of the Church in the United States, we know that even a few dollars a year have to be reckoned with by the men in those missions. The pastor of the mission may be right in declaring that all he can do is to get any kind of inexpensive candle. There is room for zealous priests and people of the better situated dioceses and parishes to do something for the honor of God in the mission districts of the States. Many a mission could be fitted up with respectable furnishings and necessities for the altar from church goods carelessly wasted in well-to-do parishes.

MAY DIOCESAN COURTS FOLLOW OPINIONS OF THEOLOGIANs?

Question: In a marriage case which a pastor presents to the diocesan court, is it correct to quote opinions of theologians as reasons why he

asks for a favorable decision in the case? May the court follow those opinions when there is no express decision of the Holy See on important aspects of the case?

CURATUS.

Answer: The main difficulty in most marriage cases turns about a satisfactory proof of the facts which are to show that under the law of the Church there was no valid marriage. Frequently doubts will arise concerning the facts as well as the interpretation of the law to be applied to the facts. If a case decided by the Holy See can be found which in substance is the same kind of case pending in the diocesan court, it is proper to follow that decision, though an individual case decided by the Holy See does not make law. If there is no precedent in the cases of the Holy See, it is certainly lawful for the diocesan court to follow the opinion of theologians, for the tribunal of the Sacred Roman Rota does not disdain to do so, as may be seen from the reported cases.

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

CASUS MORALIS

A Marriage That Was Void

By A. VERMEERSCH, S.J.

Case.—Titius, a confessor in New York City, is called to a hospital where he finds Gracchus, a penitent, who wishes to make a general confession. Gracchus has been declared an incurable consumptive, or nearly so, and cannot live for more than three months. In the confession, Gracchus says that he was married three years ago in Denmark to a certain Bertha, who is also a Catholic. But, not having received notices about a first wife whom he had married in Japan five years before, he swore that he was in no way bound. After which oath a Rev. Anscharius consented to marry him to Bertha in the Catholic Church. He did not tell Bertha anything about it. After three weeks Anscharius performed the marriage ceremony, and immediately afterwards Gracchus and Bertha came to New York City.

Interrogated by Titius, Gracchus said that he had received, two years before, an authentic document with the statement that his first wife had really died one month before the notice was given. Asked if Bertha knows, Gracchus answers in the negative, and states that he wishes that *nothing* be said to Bertha at all. There are no children. Titius now concludes that the marriage is still invalid, because it was contracted when the first wife was living, and no renewal of consent has taken place. This Anscharius could not know, as Gracchus and Bertha came to America after the marriage. Gracchus has not told it to any confessor since that time.

Therefore, Titius is certain that the marriage is invalid. But this he may not tell to Gracchus, who is already much disturbed by the questioning, and further anxiety will increase his illness. Thus, Titius tells him not to be disturbed, that everything is all right, and, if not, that he will see to it. Then he gets permission to write to Rome, if necessary. Owing to fear of *violatio sigilli* and other reasons, Titius may not go to the Bishop.

(1) How is Titius to act? Write for a "sanatio in radice"?

(2) If Titius is changed to another place before the Roman answer arrives, may he as confessor use the bishop's power *in periculo mortis*, and dispense, if he cannot without very great difficulty return when the dispensation comes? In the latter case, what is he to do with the dispensation?

Solution.—The solution of this case depends upon various circumstances. Some of them are external; others are internal.

(1) The *external* circumstances to be considered are: (a) Will Gracchus stay in that hospital until his death? (b) Will he, while in the hospital, receive visits from Bertha? And if so, is it probable that he will have relations with her that are allowed only between husband and wife?

(2) The *internal* circumstances to be considered are: (a) Is Gracchus subject to carnal temptations and desires about Bertha? (b) Does he indulge in incomplete satisfactions of the flesh, which may be tolerated in marriage?

Now, if during the three months that Gracchus may live there is no serious probability of any sexual indulgence on his part, there is no reason why Titius should do anything. Bertha is in good faith, and there are no children. If, on the contrary, there is danger of sin in Gracchus's case, then Titius has to write to the Sacred Penitentiary for a "*sanatio in radice*," noting explicitly that the case is occult.

But will the "*sanatio*" be given? Canon 1139, n. 2, formally states that the Church does not allow the "*sanatio in radice*," even after the impediment has ceased, when it is a question of an impediment arising from the natural or divine law. Thus, it is clear that no one whose authority is limited by the Code, can validly give faculties for a "*sanatio in radice*," when the obstacle to a marriage is the natural or divine law.

Nevertheless, since the Pope is above the Codex, it is not impossible for the Cardinal *Pœnitentiarius Maior*, in an audience with His Holiness, to obtain for Gracchus and Bertha a "*sanatio*." If it is granted, Titius need not be concerned about where he will be when the rescript arrives. It will be addressed to the confessor whom Gracchus will choose, and Titius has only to forward it to Gracchus with explanations to give it to the confessor he chooses. If the "*sanatio*" is refused, the only course open for Titius is to arrange a meeting with Gracchus and Bertha. From the fact that there is *periculum mortis*, and since he is bound by the seal of confession, he could dispense from the form of matrimony, and simply secure from both a new expression of matrimonial consent.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

ENCYCLICAL ON THE RESTORATION OF SOCIAL ORDER AND THE PERFECTION OF THE SAME ACCORDING TO THE LAW OF THE GOSPEL

The issue of the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* of June 1, 1931, contains the official text of this Encyclical (*Quadragesimo Anno*), which covers fifty pages. We have given excerpts from the document in the August issue of THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW, and the daily newspapers have published the translation of the text, and have commented on the Holy Father's pronouncements, some favorably and some otherwise. Naturally, the Encyclical has received the universal attention of the Catholic press, very many of the papers publishing verbatim an official translation. The words of the Vicar of Christ have thus attracted worldwide attention. The gravity of the social problems discussed—property rights, labor, wages, labor unions, and the sacred state of Christian marriage—must of necessity attract the attention of all well-meaning and serious people (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, XXIII, 177-232).

SERMON OF HIS HOLINESS IN WHICH HE PROTESTS AGAINST THE OUTRAGES DONE TO THE CATHOLIC ACTION

On the occasion of the reading of the Decree pronouncing on the heroic virtues of the Venerable Servant of God, Glycerius Landriani, in the Consistorial Hall of the Vatican, the Supreme Pontiff addressed the prelates and people present and protested against the violence and insults offered to the Catholic Action Society and Catholic clubs by the Fascist Government of Italy. The Holy Father says that he had rejoiced when he saw the teaching of the Catholic Faith introduced once more into the schools under the Concordat between the Holy See and Italy, but what the Government had given with one hand it took away with the other. For the Fascist regime has in its own organizations taught the youths ideas contrary to the Concordat, and has been successful in inciting them to acts of violence and hatred against the Catholic organizations that try to promote Christian life and virtue. The Holy Father, however, tells the young Catholic people not to fear and not to cease assisting their bishops

and priests in the promotion of Catholic life, and to remember how of old the Apostles of Christ were beaten and hated by the Jews because they had dared to preach Christ. He thanks the Catholic organizations of other countries for the sympathy they have offered him in this persecution. His Holiness says that he deserved better treatment from the Fascist Government, which he has more than once upheld and praised for the good it had accomplished, and towards which he had repeatedly extended the hand of peace (May 31, 1931; *Acta Apost. Sedis*, XXIII, 229).

BOOK BY ALBERTO DEL FANTE CONDEMNED

The Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office has declared that the book entitled "A Padre Pio di Pietralcina, l'Araldo del Signore," by Alberto Del Fante (published by Galleri, Bologna, 1931), is *ipso iure* prohibited in accordance with Canon 1399, n. 5; and furthermore that, in accordance with Canon 1398, § 1, it is forbidden to print, read, retain, or sell this work or translate it into any other language. Consequently, this work falls into the category of prohibited books without further announcement. At the same time, the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office reminds all Catholics of the former prohibition published in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* (XV, 356, and XVI, 368), by which all communication with Father Pius of Pietralcina, even by letter, is forbidden (Notification of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, May 22, 1931; *Acta Apost. Sedis*, XXIII, 233).

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF THE VICAR-GENERAL AND VICAR-CAPITULAR

The following *dubia* were submitted to the Sacred Congregation of the Council for solution:

- (1) whether, in view of his right of precedence, the rights and duties mentioned in Canon 397 devolve on the Vicar-General;
- (2) whether, in view of his right of precedence, the Vicar-General is, as a Canon, exempt from assisting the Bishop at Mass and other Pontifical Functions;
- (3) whether the Vicar-Capitular, in virtue of his office, has the

right and duty to perform the sacred functions on the more solemn feasts of the year, referred to in Canon 397, n. 1.

With the approval and confirmation of the Holy Father, the Sacred Congregation has answered all three questions in the negative (*Acta. Apost. Sed.*, XXIII, 235).

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS

The following have been appointed Domestic Prelates to His Holiness: Right Rev. Msgr. James J. Redmond (Archdiocese of Liverpool), Robert C. Maguire, William Cahill, William H. Griffin (Archdiocese of Chicago), Charles A. Hickey, William Cooke, Joseph D. Fisch, and Thomas Martin O'Connell (Archdiocese of Cincinnati).

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Homiletic Part

Sermon Material for the Month of September

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Human Life

By D. J. MACDONALD, Ph.D.

"And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak" (Luke, vii. 15).

SYNOPSIS: Introduction:

I. Differences between dead matter and living person.

II. Differences between animals and men.

III. Origin of life.

Conclusion.

In the seventh chapter of his Gospel, St. Luke describes the miraculous curing of the centurion's servant at Capharnaum. He then continues: "And it came to pass afterwards that He went into a city called Naim, and there went with Him His disciples and a great multitude." They arrived at the gate of the city just as a funeral procession was going out to bury the only son of a widow. Our Divine Saviour approached the widow and said to her: "Weep not." First of all, consider the assurance with which these words were uttered. In them there is no hesitation or uncertainty. If Christ were not God, how could He speak with such assurance? In these words Christ practically pledges Himself before the whole multitude to do the humanly impossible, to remove the cause of her weeping. He approaches the bier, touches it, and says: "Young man, I say to thee, arise. And he that was dead sat up and began to speak." Note here that our Divine Saviour does not pray God to restore this young man to life, as was done by St. Peter and others when they restored the dead to life, but used His own divine power to perform this wonderful miracle.

The Gospels record three raisings of the dead to life—the raising of the daughter of Jairus, the raising of Lazarus, and that of today's Gospel. The facts themselves cannot be reasonably doubted. Some explanation of them must be found by unbelievers, and so they say that these persons were not really dead, but only seemed to be dead. With regard to this explanation it has been well said: "The sup-

porters of natural interpretation pretend that the young man was merely overtaken by a lethargic sleep. In that case, the miracle of power would only disappear to make room for a miracle of knowledge equally difficult to understand. For how could Jesus know that the supposed dead man was still alive, and that the moment of his awakening was at hand?"

LIVING PERSONS VASTLY DIFFERENT FROM DEAD MATTER

In outward appearance there is not much difference between a young man dead and a young man alive. But in reality what a tremendous difference exists between these two states! The difference is so great that we are forced to discredit the contention of our modern materialists that life is nothing but a function of matter, that a living person is nothing but physical matter. Dead, this young man cannot move himself; he can no longer assimilate food and make it part of his bones and muscles. Dead, he can no longer compose poetry or plan empires; he can no longer be influenced by the ideas and ideals around him. In the ordinary course of events his dead body would be dissolved into dust. But alive he can overcome the forces making for his dissolution. He can love and hate. He can create ideas and institutions that may revolutionize the world.

Nowadays it is important to note the tremendous difference between a living person and physical matter, because so much is being written and said about the similarity between living things and ordinary matter. Living things—even human beings, according to many reputable scientists—have nothing in them that is not in dead matter. All life activities—even mental operations, according to them—are the product of physical and chemical forces. They deny that there is any difference between mental activity and physical activity. Thought arises from an arrangement of the atoms of the brain; new thoughts come from some rearrangement of these atoms. Our living bodies are mere machines. Science, they say, has done away with the notion of the soul.

There are too many differences between living things and non-living things and too many differences between animals and man to warrant our saying that they are all mere matter.

First of all, dead matter cannot move itself as living matter can.

Dead matter can only be moved by a force outside itself; living things move themselves in many ways. Living things make their food part of themselves; dead matter cannot do this. Living things can repair injuries received; but this dead matter has never done. No machine, for example, can repair a broken wheel. The salamander can even replace its legs and tail if it has been deprived of them. Living things can reproduce themselves. What dead matter can do this? The human being develops from a single cell. This cell develops into cells of different kinds—skin-cells, brain-cells, etc.—and into the marvellous organization of them, the human body. Who ever heard of a saw developing into a furniture factory? And yet in spite of all these differences some scientists claim that living things have no powers beyond the physical and chemical forces of dead matter.

MAN VERY DIFFERENT FROM OTHER LIVING THINGS

Great as is the difference between living things and dead matter, there is a still greater difference between man and animals. The activities of man are as superior to the activities of animals as the activities of living things are superior to the activities of non-living things. According to the materialist there should not be much difference between the activities of anthropoid apes and those of man, because anatomically they are very much alike, particularly with regard to brain structure. If, then, the brains of these apes and the brains of man are very much alike, and if "the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile," how explain the tremendous difference between the activities of man and ape? Who ever heard of an ape writing poetry or a treatise on philosophy, and yet if all mental activity is merely physical and chemical activity, we would expect to find somewhere books on geometry by Mr. Baboon.

Man is on a plane different from that of plants and animals. He is both spiritual and material. He is a compound of spirit and matter—body and soul. Body and soul are united together to form one substance, one person. The soul, though, is capable of existing independently of the body. Moreover, it is immortal. If it is not immortal, and if the wrongs of this world are not going to be righted in a future one, then the moral and spiritual part of this world is a farce. There can be no doubt, however, but that the Being who

is responsible for the perfection of the rose has provided for a corresponding perfection or completion in human affairs—and this requires the immortality of the soul. Moreover, there is an innate and insatiable desire for happiness in every human being. But happiness would not be true happiness unless it is eternal. Therefore, the existence of God and the goodness of God require that the soul be immortal.

GOD, THE AUTHOR OF LIFE

The tremendous differences between living and non-living things establish the reasonableness of the Christian contention with regard to the origin of life. If, as some scientists maintain, there is no fundamental difference between living things and non-living things, then life might have evolved from non-living matter through the operation of physical forces. Life, according to them, is simply physical force. But I have shown you that the differences between them are too great to admit this. Much as some scientists would like to develop life from dead matter, they have never been able to do so.

All life comes from preëxisting life. But life must have had a beginning on this planet. There was a time when this planet was so hot that no form of life could have existed on it. Only dead matter could have been there. Now, if life cannot be deduced from dead matter, where did the first life come from? To this the materialist has no answer. The Christian, relying on the common sense postulate that every effect must have an adequate cause, believes that the establishment of life on this planet was the work of a living first cause, whom we call God. Here let it be noted that, even if life could be evolved from matter, we would still have to postulate the existence of a First Cause who put into matter the power of developing into life, and all the wonderful manifestations of life that we see around us.

CONCLUSION

Do not be led astray by the half-truths or the false deductions from whole truths that are so prevalent with regard to the nature of life and of man. Man is composed of matter and spirit, body and soul. The operations of the spirit are conditioned to some ex-

tent by the conditions of the body, certainly. But from this fact beware of the false deduction that man is only body, only matter.

A great deal of false sociological theory and bad social practice obtain because they are based on false conceptions of the nature and origin of human life. These false ideas are responsible for a good deal of irreligion. If life is a mere function of matter, then religion is humbug, birth control legitimate, and old age pensions a delusion. If this life is the only life, then the only reasonable thing to do with the aged and incurably sick is to chloroform them.

In us there is something that matter cannot do, that plants cannot do, that animals cannot do. "Thou hast made him a little less than the angels, Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor" (Ps. viii. 6). In us there is a craving for happiness which demands that we be immortal. In us there is an immortal soul, and we should keep that truth before us in all our actions.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Third Commandment

By R. J. MEANEY, O.P.

"Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day (Exod., xx. 8).

SYNOPSIS: I. *The Sabbath of the Old Law.*

II. *The Sunday of the Gospel.*

III. *What Sunday should mean for the Catholic.*

In the first and second commandments the way is cleared of impediments to the worship of the true God. In the third commandment, "Thou shalt keep holy the Sabbath," two things are implied: first, the external worship of God by the intelligent creature, which is a law of nature and irrevocable; second, the fixing of one day in seven on which, by the suppression of labor and the offering of special sacrifice, the day itself was sanctified to the Lord. This latter part of the commandment was of the ceremonial law, and not irrevocable.

The word "sabbath" means a cessation, or respite. For the Jews it represented the rest which the Lord observed after the six "days" of creation. It recalled for the Jews also their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt.

THE SABBATH OF THE OLD LAW

The first announcement of the Sabbath occurred during the wandering in the desert, when the people were required to gather a double supply of manna the day before. In the twentieth chapter of Exodus the law of the Sabbath is written as the third of the ten commandments, and in the thirty-fourth chapter of the same Book the severest penalties are laid down for those who fail to observe the law. Many times in the Old Testament we find the prophets and teachers of Israel reminding the people of the Sabbath obligation, and, while the Jews were often guilty of violating the law, the law itself was never relaxed.

In the course of time, however, minute and burdensome regulations were introduced which, with a servile insistence on the letter, ignored the spirit of the law. So, when Our Saviour appeared among men, the vain rigorism of the Pharisees had well nigh obscured the higher purpose of the Sabbath. In the Gospel for today Jesus once more corrects the false teaching of the Pharisees. What could be more pleasing to God, the Father, than the work of mercy done to our neighbor in His name? How could the Sabbath be kept holy in suspending the universal law of charity? The object of the Sabbath in the Old Law, as in the New, was to recall the benefits God had showered on His people. The Sabbath was a day of respite from that labor which was a penalty of sin—a festival day, therefore, joyfully sanctified to the Lord (Is., lviii. 13).

THE SABBATH OF THE NEW LAW

In the New Testament we have the same law of the Sabbath with the day of its observance changed. After the Passion and Death of Jesus, there were added to the benefits of creation the greater and higher benefits of redemption and sanctification. Jesus triumphed over death and the Holy Ghost came down upon the Apostles on the first day of the week; and, with this fact in mind, the Apostles began to observe the Sunday of the New Law instead of the Sabbath of the Old. The practice of meeting on the first day of the week to celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice was established during the lifetime of St. Paul (Acts, xx).

The Sabbath of the Old Law being abolished, it remained for

the Church to determine how the law of external worship, due to God from the creature, was to be fulfilled. At the Last Supper, Jesus, after He had changed bread and wine into His Body and Blood, said to the future Apostles: "Do this for a commemoration of Me" (Luke, xxii. 19). At this Last Supper, and in the long discourse which followed (John, xiv-xv), the Apostles received that which the Holy Ghost afterwards gave them to understand—the power to renew the Sacrifice that taketh away the sins of the world. They found themselves in possession of the Offering forever pleasing to God, the Father—the clean Oblation, of which all the sacrifices of the Old Law were but the types and figures; and this alone determined for them how the Sabbath of the New Law should be sanctified to the Lord.

OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY IN THE EARLY CHURCH

During three centuries of persecution Christians assembled in small groups at any hour on any day of the week—at Rome in the Catacombs or in the house of a Christian. The Holy Sacrifice was offered; they received Communion and sang hymns of thanksgiving. Because the watchful eye of the Roman official was ever upon them, they spoke of the Holy Sacrifice in obscure and even in misleading terms; but the fact remains that the "breaking of bread," which was later called "Mass" and "Holy Communion," was the sum and substance of the early Christian's worship. The Eucharist was for them the Sun that gave warmth and light to the Gospel teaching, and gave to them who partook of it the courage to remain steadfast under persecution and finally to triumph over the enemies of the infant Church.

As soon as persecution ceased, the Church began at once to legislate for the observance of the Sunday. Before the end of the fourth century the obligation to assist at Mass and to refrain from servile work, both regulations being traced to the Apostles, was the written law of the Church. But the minute regulations of the Old Law of fear no longer had place under the New Law of love; and the legislation of the Church has been governed, all through the centuries, by the teaching of Him who said: "The Sabbath was made for man" (Mark, ii. 27).

The Church teaches that Sunday is the Lord's Day—a day of

joy and gladness, the festival of the ever-blessed Trinity. To sanctify the day the people are to assemble in church and there join with the priest in offering to God the Sacrifice which alone can render Him due honor and can obtain for them every spiritual and temporal blessing. This is the altar that, as St. Paul said, hath supplanted the tabernacle of the covenant (Heb., xiii. 10-15).

Hence, Christian architecture has ever sought to enshrine it, and Christian art has created masterpieces of painting, sculpture and music to interpret it for the people. So the Mass is today the sun and center of worship for the Catholic as it was for the Christian who was taught by the Apostles.

HOW WE SHOULD OBSERVE SUNDAY

Besides the obligation of attendance at Mass which is directly commanded, there remain for the Catholic the law of rest from labor and the counsel to spend the day in works of mercy and charity according to the ability and opportunity of the individual. The Catholic, therefore, who after an hour at Mass spends the day in unnecessary work or dissipation, is not observing the Sabbath according to the mind of the Church.

Let me call your attention to this point, my brethren. The day of rest from labor will be of little benefit if it does not bring you nearer to God. After six days of toil you are entitled to the day of rest; but the Church seeks to give you far more than this. The Sabbath morn opens up for you another world in which the interests of this world are lost to view, in which the things of God and eternity are seen in true perspective. To sanctify the Christian Sabbath, therefore, two things are to be borne in mind by the sincere Catholic: the attendance at Mass and the active work of the Church Militant in your own parish.

First, the attendance at Mass. This does not mean merely your presence in church. The intelligent Catholic understands the ceremonies of the Mass. He is able to follow every movement of the priest at the altar, and for the time is a companion of Mary at the foot of the cross and not one of the rabble standing idly by. The intelligent Catholic can interpret the Church's Liturgy. At the Solemn Mass with its formal sermon he is lifted up to the company

of the angels, to the supernatural world of grace and glory, to a vision of God that will abide to strengthen him in every need.

The reason the parish High Mass is not appreciated as it ought to be, is found in the culpable ignorance all too widespread among Catholics, who do not grasp the beauty, the significance and grandeur of the Holy Sacrifice, the most perfect act of worship the creature can offer to the Creator.

WORKS OF EDIFICATION

Secondly, by the work of the Church in your parish I mean any of the activities fostered by the Church for the edification of the Catholic body and for the purpose of bringing Catholic doctrine and belief to the knowledge of those who would love your religion if they but knew it. I cannot express it definitely because it must vary as to time and place, but your first effort should be to prepare yourself to take part in these activities intelligently and helpfully.

If you know your religion, you will find a real pleasure in explaining it patiently to others who know it not or have been taught to hate it. If you appreciate as you ought the gift of faith in Christ and His Church, you can understand God's will that others shall receive the same gift through your efforts and prayers. In your social and business life you come into contact with those whom the voice of your pastor can never reach, and it is God's will that your good example and influence should lead many of them to seek the light that you have received. Above all, remember that Christ the Lord is ever waiting for you, eager to reward the least service you render the poor, the unfortunate, the outcast, the sinner.

Why, therefore, stand ye all the day idle? Why not do your part to further the efforts of your pastor and bishop for the promotion of Catholic charity, Catholic education, Catholic literature, the Catholic Press? If you are prepared for them, opportunities will multiply wherein you may make some return to God for the talent He has entrusted to you.

OUR DUTY AND OPPORTUNITY TODAY

Never, since the day of Pentecost, has the membership of the Church been placed in a field so ripe for the harvest as at present. Hatred of your Church and Religion is as widespread and as pow-

erful as ever, but this is according to the promise and shall ever be so. The truth for you to remember is this: the vast body of our separated brethren known as Evangelical Christians, numerous and powerful opponents of our Church fifty years ago, find themselves today robbed of the Gospel, without teaching, without a church. Many thousands of them, sincere believers in Christ and His Gospel, are groping in the dark; but they will seek and find the light through the Catholic layman who knows and loves his religion.

For every Catholic, therefore, there are abundant means at hand to sanctify the Sabbath, and in so doing bring down God's blessing on the family and the home. Exercising the freedom of the Gospel, you can satisfy your religious obligation, renew the bond of fellowship and charity with your neighbor, with ample time for innocent recreation, and thus make your Sunday what the Church intends—a day of rest and peace that will enable you to face the world each coming week with the love of Christ singing in your heart.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Catholic Unity

By H. B. LOUGHNAN, S.J.

"One Lord, One Faith" (Eph., iv. 5)

SYNOPSIS: *I. Objective of the sermon: an appreciation that is effective in its consequences, not mere boasting about the marvel of the Church's unity of faith.*

II. Contrasts: (i) The League of Nations. International jealousy prevents complete union; there is an inability to submit to one authority. How then account for the amazing fact of the international unity of 360 millions of men; a short discussion on the naturalistic explanations that are attempted.

(ii) The Catholic and the non-Catholic "unity amongst the Churches." The recent controversy on the Anglican Prayer Book.

(iii) Contrast the recent discussions on birth-control.

III. Obvious conclusion.

My dear brethren: I want to deepen your appreciation of the Catholic Church; to make you realize that there are certain features in her life which possibly strike the non-Catholics more forcibly than they do some Catholics; to make you feel that, while at the present

time the eyes of the world are directed towards this City set on a Hill, yet its inhabitants, inheriting what has been hers for centuries, do not always fully realize the nature of their treasured possession. I want to make you enthusiastic about that one institution, that one religion, that one Church, which, whether appreciated or maligned, is at least envied for its success.

If I make this point clear, there is every hope that your deepened appreciation of your position as Catholics will cause you to be truer and more loyal, with a truth and a loyalty that burn brightest in the hidden recesses of your own conscience. For my object is not to make you merely boast about our religion and to gloat over the contrast between the Catholic and every other Church; instead, it is to make you feel that you are not sincere in your praise unless you do your very best to live before God as worthy members of His Church. Let me, then, recall a few facts that seem disconnected, though they all center in the standing miracle of the Catholic unity of faith.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

You have been following the varied fortunes of the League of Nations, and you know the high ideals which inspired its origin. Nations were to unite together, and by agreeing upon a common course of action were to settle their differences in a peaceful way. To a limited—a very limited—degree success has been achieved. Yet, we know that for years the greatest countries of the world have not been members of that body; that from time to time nations have withdrawn from the League. All through its chequered history we see distinct and unmistakable signs of national jealousy, of attempts to secure undue influence, of suspicions lest one nation might win disproportionate power, of unwillingness—nay of utter inability—to submit to the decision of any one single person. Further, it would be regarded as preposterous and absurd that any ruling or law be accepted by the League, unless its members were first consulted. For to accept the decisions of any such lawgiver would be stigmatized as undemocratic, as well as impossible. If any such proposal were made, it would meet with the obvious reply that no natural power on earth could persuade the peoples of nations that differed in culture, class and customs, to accept without question the

rulings of one central authority. And the proposal would be the more quixotic, if the nations concerned were to have no say in the appointment of this authority.

CONTRAST OF CATHOLIC UNITY

Now, open your eyes and look at an amazing fact. Some 360,000,000 people, scattered the wide world over, are willing to accept the teaching and the disciplinary measures of one man in whose election they have not a vote! For, His Holiness the Pope has not a primacy of honor only; he is not a mere figurehead, who, while wearing the trappings of sovereignty, is dictated to by those whom he governs. Instead he has, centered in himself alone, a personal authority in faith and in government.

Dwell on this strange fact, and see if you can explain by any natural means the unity of the Catholic Church. Recall that for years Germans and French agreed on nothing except in the belief of each that the other must be destroyed; Australians and Chinese are strongly and strangely averse; Americans and English, sharing much in common, yet differ widely in temperament and outlook; imperialists and nationalists are poles apart; and at present the world is witnessing a cleavage between the classes of society. Yet, in spite of these massive barriers which separate them, we find a vast and enormous body of men of all these nations and classes welded together into a corporate whole and keeping the unity of faith of which St. Paul speaks in today's Epistle. The amazing fact simply shouts out for an explanation. How can we account for this huge international body willingly submitting—as I have said—to the untrammelled authority of one man in whose election they have no vote? Whose is the hand that welded them together? Whose is the force that keeps them one? What is it that has achieved success, where the League of the world's nations has failed? The only answer possible is that the City set on a Hill was founded by God, and survives through the strength of His guiding providence. No other explanation can be given of this international unity.

ATTEMPTS AT EXPLAINING CATHOLIC UNITY

There is no time to discuss the criticisms made against this argument. They are to the effect that various natural causes have led

to the Catholic Church holding its unique position of today. Some like Seeley and the later rationalists would explain away Christ's power over the human heart by denying His Divinity, and instead would make Him a mere man whose character and teaching prevailed upon the world which needed a man such as He was. Gibbon in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" would account for the origin and growth of the Catholic Church by a combination of chance and chicanery. Others today would conveniently forget that Catholics have brains: they would say that the Catholic Church secures its unity by playing on the superstition and ignorance of its members, or by offering great incentives to those who defend its teaching. Recent psychologists would appeal to the "Group Mind," to inherited or innate awe, as an explanation of the amazing position of the Catholic Church.

One answer must be enough. To the rest of the world the Catholic Church's unity is an object of envy. If they could, they would destroy her; if they could, they would substitute another religion. Why, then, if they know the secret of her success, do they not copy her? They have had the whole force of political and military machinery at their disposal, and have failed; they have had wealth and culture and learning and history to help them, but they have not reared another lasting institution with the unity of faith of which we read today at Mass. They have copied certain phases of her life—her ritual, her sacraments, her devotions; they have claimed her title of "Catholic"; they have claimed her Saints (if consistent they should canonize their own!); they have claimed her prayers and use them. But one thing they cannot claim or copy—and that one thing is her unity of faith. They assert some sort of unity amongst themselves, on the score that they at least agree upon the contents of the old Creeds, like the Apostles' and the Nicene. Yet, you and I know that the very first word causes dissension among them, for they cannot agree even on the meaning of the word "believe" (some taking it to signify "confide in," as when one "believes in" a patent medicine); much less can they tell you what they mean by the doctrines of the Creed. No, there is not the slightest sign of agreement on the so-called fundamental truths of Christianity.

SOME OTHER CONTRASTS

But let me show you some other interesting contrasts. In far away Colombo you will find devout Cingalese in silent prayer before the tabernacle in the Catholic Church; in China and Japan there are old Catholic families who have kept the faith handed down from the time of St. Francis Xavier; in the cities of Australia, as elsewhere, you will find workingmen coming in their working clothes to Mass and Holy Communion on week-days; in the universities of France and of England you will find professors and students at the communion rails; in Greece and Czecho-Slovakia and Syria and Armenia you will find Mass said in the old native languages of those countries. Yet, despite the difference of ritual and of practice and of types of devotion, you have the same marvellous fact facing you—all these peoples have precisely the same belief as have your children in the parish school here; one and all, with clear-cut precision and unambiguously, they will tell you that in Holy Communion they receive the living God-Man, Jesus Christ.

And now look at a different picture. Today amongst non-Catholic bodies the war cry is for "unity amongst the Churches." It is admitted that there is a wound which needs healing; that sectarian differences are largely responsible for the non-Catholic "problem of the empty church"; that denominations should be joined together. And yet, when attempting to unify, they carefully guard against even a semblance of unity of faith. Thus, for instance, you may remember that in the national Church of England its members were, and are, divided on this very question of the Blessed Eucharist; some held it is idolatry to adore, while others asserted that failure to adore is the highest irreverence and insult. An appeal was made to the episcopacy in the hope that the teaching of that Church would be made plain. But you know the result, which in effect came to this: "We cannot tell you; if you think that the Blessed Eucharist is after all nothing more than bread, then of course don't adore it, and be content with the ritual of the Old Prayer Book; but if you think that the Eucharist is really Jesus Christ, then adore it, and we will give you a new edition of the Prayer Book so worded that you can read your belief into it."

This was obviously tantamount to an explicit rejection of any claim to teach. It resulted in a more deep-rooted lack of unity.

In the face of this, is it too much to plead with you to be proud of and loyally obedient to your Church, whose unity of faith is the inspiring envy of those outside her fold?

UNITY OF TEACHING

And here is another contrast—one that has a very personal application to you married Catholic men and women. You will find it eloquently and ungrudgingly stated by a Baptist minister in *The Hibbart Journal* for October, 1930. Fearlessly and clearly and full in the face of the opposition of a half-pagan world, the Catholic Church asserts what is the natural law in regard to birth-control. Her teaching is that any means other than chaste self-restraint are unnatural, and therefore against the purposes of the Author of nature; that it is morally a grave offense to stir the sacred springs of life and then deliberately to poison them and rob them of their vital power.

Now, on the one hand, there is not and there cannot be any doubt as to what is the teaching of the Church on this matter; neither is there any bickering or questioning on the part of her members. But, on the other hand, note the characteristic position taken up by the non-Catholic churches. They have either not dared to run counter to public opinion, and have adopted silence as a protective screen; or, as in England, they have stated their views in such a veiled and guarded way that they can shield themselves both against the charge of allowing lax morality, and against the accusation of not being abreast of the times. Further, no sooner was the pronouncement made by the Lambeth Conference than the verdict called forth, in the pulpit and in the press, spirited protests from their own clergy and their own bishops. In the face of this, what claim can there be to that unity of faith on which St. Paul lays such great stress?

Let me end on the same note as that on which I began. Your appreciation of the faith that is yours must not consist in mere words. Your inner and private life, of which God alone is the witness, must show that your conduct squares with your belief.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Perseverance

By JAMES S. LINEEN, B.A.

"Who also will confirm you unto the end without crime, in the day of the coming of Christ Jesus Our Lord." (I Cor. i. 8).

SYNOPSIS: *I. Importance of the end.*

II. Salutory fear.

III. Dangers escaped.

IV. Combats to be endured.

V. Means.

It is the end that matters. We are all starters in the great race for salvation. We may set off well, continue the course for a considerable time, surmount the obstacles that stand in our way, display plenty of staying power, but unless the effort be sustained to the end the early promise is of no avail.

The prizes are for the victors only. The goal is God Almighty. Nothing short of Him is victory, no matter what energies may have been previously expended. If He be lost, all is lost whatever else is gained: if He be reached, all is won whatever else is lost. A good start is useful, a sustained effort indispensable, but he and he only who shall persevere to the end shall be saved. "What will it profit us," says St. Augustine, "to have followed Christ, if we are not with Him when life ends?"

ST. PAUL'S FEAR

What confident hope for the salvation of his dear Corinthians rings out in St. Paul's message in the Epistle of today! "Brethren, I give thanks to my God always for you, for the grace that is in you in Christ Jesus, that in all things you are made rich in Him, in every word, and in all knowledge: as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: so that nothing is wanting to you in any grace, waiting for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ, who also will confirm you unto the end without crime, in the day of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Encouraging though this message evidently is, we seem to read between the lines a certain salutory fear or a note of warning. "Beware," he seems to say to them, "beware of yourselves! On the part of Christ your salvation is assured. On your own part it is certain,

but on one condition—namely, your correspondence with the graces received.”

Few could weigh up the pros and cons of the case for salvation with the same keen insight as the great Apostle, St. Paul. Few could express themselves so clearly in matters pertaining to the soul's destiny. Few had less reason to fear eternal perdition. Yet, notwithstanding all his trials and sufferings, his indefatigable labors, his unswerving devotion to the cross of Christ, he is not free from that same lurking fear of eternal damnation. “I chastise my body and bring it into subjection, lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself may become a castaway.”

If big men quail at the thought of their eternal destiny, if stalwart champions of the faith feel the necessity of continually screwing their courage to the sticking place, how indispensable to ordinary mortals is the hope “that Christ will confirm us unto the end without crime,” and even more so that salutary fear lest we ourselves should place insurmountable obstacles in His way! This fear will serve to remind us of the necessity of persevering in grace. It will keep our eyes open to the dangers we have escaped, the combats still to be endured, and thus provide a strong incentive to virtue.

DANGERS WE HAVE ESCAPED

We read in the life of a saintly Bishop of Amiens that in preparation for his frequent confessions he visited in fancy Hell, Heaven and Calvary the better to arouse contrition and a firm purpose of amendment. In Hell he contemplated the torments of the damned, the pain caused by the devouring and inextinguishable flames, the craving of the heart of man for his God, the helpless condition of these victims of their own folly deprived forever of the slightest glimmer of hope. There “mid horrid shapes and shrieks and sights unholy,” mid scenes that in their ugliness beggar description, he thanked the good God who had saved him from tortures which it seemed to him his sins had rightly deserved, and prayed earnestly for the grace of perseverance.

On the wings of fancy he next ascended to the realm of the blessed. There peering round amid scenes of entrancing beauty he realized the meaning of the words of St. Paul: “Eye hath not seen

nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the greatness of the glory which God has in store for those who love Him." He wept to think that he had shut against himself the portals of this happy mansion, and became more persistent in his supplications to the Almighty that one day he might become a citizen of that celestial kingdom.

Next he betook himself to Calvary. Fixing his gaze on the face of the dead Christ, he said to Him: "This is my work. I am the cause of your excruciating torments. I have joined with other sinners in covering with wounds Your Sacred Body, crucifying You and compassing Your death. What injury had You done me? How did I dare to treat You thus? My God who loved me so tenderly and loved me to the end, I am sorry. I thank You for making me realize the folly of my ways, the dangers I have escaped. I beg of You to give me the necessary help to persevere unto the end without crime."

If this saintly Bishop whose humility exaggerated his faults deemed it advisable to consider so carefully the dangers he had escaped in order to help him to perseverance, how much more are these same precautions necessary to us who have so often shown ourselves weak and vacillating in the face of temptation!

COMBATS TO SUSTAIN

The life of man upon earth is a warfare which will end only with life itself. The struggle must be continuous. "Without perseverance," says St. Augustine, "he who fights does not obtain the victory, nor does the victor obtain the palm." "Know ye not," says St. Paul, "that they that run in the race all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize?" (I Cor., ix. 24). In the struggle for salvation there is no such thing as resting on our oars. If we are not fighting the current, we are being carried away by it. "I beseech you, Son," says St. Jerome, "and with paternal love exhort you who have abandoned Sodom and are hastening to the lofty heights not to look behind you, lest you should let go the handle of the plough—the garment of the Saviour which you have begun to hold;...lest you should return from the field to the house; lest you should love the plains with Lot, or the beauty of the gardens that are not

watered from heaven as holy land but by the muddy flood of Jordan. Many have begun, few have persevered to the end."

We may have begun well and continued in the straight and narrow way unswervingly up to the present. There may be many miles yet to go, and whether that way be long or short it is bristling with difficulties. Many who have begun well have ended badly. Many who have begun badly have ended well. Not only the first step—but every step along the road must be carefully taken—the most important being the last. St. Paul started as a persecutor and finished as a stalwart champion of the faith, obtaining the crown of glory which Christ the just judge had laid up for him. Judas made a good start but lacked staying power. Eventually he betrayed the Master whose cause he had espoused and went to his own place.

"If the just man shall turn himself away from his justice, and do iniquity according to all the abominations which the wicked man useth to work, shall he live? All his justices which he hath done, shall not be remembered: in the prevarication by which he hath prevaricated, and in his sin which he hath committed, in them shall he die." (Ezech., xviii, 24). What does it profit me that the green corn gives hope of a harvest, if before the time of reaping that hope is destroyed by a sudden storm or a flood?

MEANS OF PERSEVERANCE

The way may seem long and dreary. The prize is great and everlasting. The difficulties though considerable may be diminished by mistrusting ourselves, frequenting the Sacraments, and being constant in prayer. Place not too much confidence in your own strength of will. "He that thinketh himself to stand," says St. Paul, "let him beware lest he fall." Make use of the remedies and preventatives specially provided by Jesus Christ in the Sacraments. Give to worldly affairs the time that is necessary, but do not neglect the most important affair of all, that of your eternal salvation. The Sacraments are specially designed for our benefit, and meet all our needs. It would be the height of temerity to use them only under compulsion, as it were. Speaking of the damned, St. Augustine says: "God would not have abandoned you if you had not abandoned Him, but would have conducted you to eternal happiness."

“Watch ye and pray,” says St. Matthew, “that you enter not into temptation.” Neglect prayer, and your spiritual vision will soon become impaired, your defective outlook will give you a wrong estimate of values. Acquire the spirit of prayer and your eternal salvation is assured. “Enlighten my eyes,” says the Psalmist, “that I may never sleep in death; lest at any time my enemy say: I have prevailed against him.” Watch, frequent the Sacraments, and pray, and you may rest assured that you will “persevere unto the end without crime in the day of the coming of Christ Jesus our Lord.”

Book Reviews

HOMILETICS

The Boston University School of Theology Lectures on Preaching have thus far resulted in three volumes, interestingly entitled, "Effective Preaching," "Creative Preaching," and "Contemporary Preaching." All three are edited by G. Bromley Oxnam, President of DePauw University. Only the last two have come into the hands of the Reviewer and will be noticed here.

The title, "Creative Preaching," is explained in the Introduction to this volume:¹ "Is it not possible for the preacher, in his hours of personal devotion, to stand in the very presence of the mind of God? Is it too much to hope that an interplay of thought between the mind of God and the mind of the preacher may result when the preacher finds himself in the presence of God? . . . Similar stimulation will be found in his personal contact with human beings of every walk in life. . . . I take it that the supreme objective in Christian preaching is to create new life: that is life like the life that was in Christ Jesus. He who creates that new life is preaching creatively." The title of the following volume,² "Contemporary Preaching," is also explained by the Editor in the Introduction: "Contemporary Christianity has been fighting a rear-guard action upon a world-wide scale. Its strategists have ignored a fundamental principle of warfare, namely, the attacker is spiritually superior to the defender. Marshal Foch, who enunciated this principle, insisted that 'Victory equals will.'" The two volumes provide interesting reading and purposive stimulation. Thirty-one different preachers contributed to them, bringing to the Lectures many points of view, theoretical and practical, on the subject of preaching. Limitations of space prevent even an enumeration of the subjects treated and the viewpoints thereon taken by the respective lecturers.

Very different in character is, of course, the Manual of Homiletics written by Père A.-D. Sertillanges, O.P., under the title of *L'Orateur Chrétien*.³ One experienced preacher (described, indeed, by the Most Rev. Father Gillet, Master-General of the Dominicans, as a preacher "d'une expérience incomparable") here puts into a single volume a series of chapters or headings progressively conceived and elaborately discussed, and accordingly covering all the requirements of the Catholic

¹ *Creative Preaching*, edited by G. Bromley Oxnam (Abingdon Press, New York City).

² *Contemporary Preaching* (same publisher and editor, 1931, 256 pp.).

³ *L'Orateur Chrétien*, by A. D. Sertillanges, O.P., Membre de l'Institut. Preface by the Very Rev. P. Gillet, Maître Général des Frères Prêcheurs (Les Editions du Cerf: Juvisy, Seine-et-Oise, xii + 439 pp.).

preacher in respect of counsel and method in the theory of preaching, down even to such minutiae as the values and difficulties of rhythm in style and correctness of pronunciation. The method is scholastic in its divisions and subdivisions of the themes treated, but the style is engagingly full of a certain sparkling quality of rhetoric which seems to rob the book of anything like a dry formalism. It is, therefore, suited alike to priest and seminarist. In format, the volume is like the two books reviewed above; but the thin paper (opaque, nevertheless) and the close (but clear) printing combine to make the volume nearly equal in contents to the combined two volumes edited by Dr. Oxnam. All three volumes lack an Alphabetical Index.

No department of theological studies in our seminaries has anything like the amount of pedagogical lore expended on Homiletics, although there are, it is true, innumerable text-books of theology. It might well have appeared impossible for a present-day scholar to put into a comparatively small book a series of helpful chapters on the bibliography of Homiletics. But the task has been essayed and admirably completed by Father Stephen J. Brown, S.J., within the space of 130 pages.⁴ His Foreword justly demands good space in which to describe his purpose. A few words may be quoted here: "The purpose of this little book is to provide something in the nature of a conspectus or bird's eye view of sermon literature, to map out the ground in a methodical fashion, as far as that is possible. Such a scope is a very wide one, it must be confessed, but I hasten to restrict it within certain limitations. The aim being utility, practical and general, rather than scientific completeness, I have not thought it well to include works in foreign languages not likely to be known to the majority of those who will use the book." He refers only to Catholic homiletic literature, "at least as regards books in which there is dogmatic teaching." Books of theory and practice, preacher's aids, models, categorized books of sermons, on the Scriptures, and the like, are noted and summarily evaluated. There is an Alphabetical List of Preachers and Their Works, and an Index (of 450 names)—a *multum in parvo*.

Theory and practice combine in Father Honnef's Second Series of Homilies⁵ for all the Sundays of the Year according to the plan of his First Series (noticed in the REVIEW of October, 1929). He selects from the Gospels narratives outside of the prescribed Sunday pericopes, in order to familiarize the people with the life of Our Saviour as viewed in other perspectives, whilst preserving the spirit of the Sacred Liturgy throughout the Church Year. Thus, for instance, he

⁴ *The Preacher's Library: A Survey of Pulpit Literature*, by Stephen J. Brown, S.J. (Sheed and Ward, London, 130 pp.).

⁵ *Die Botschaft des Wortes Gottes*, by Dr. Johannes Honnef. Vol. II, *Homilien auf die Sonntage des Kirchenjahres* (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo., 1931, 311 pp.).

takes for the First Sunday of Advent Luke i. 26-33; for the Second, Luke, i. 39-57; for the Third, Matt. i. 18-25, and so on. Christ is the central figure.

H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

"TREASURY OF THE FAITH"

Three new volumes of the 36-volume set "Treasury of the Faith Series" (The Macmillan Co., New York) have just appeared, and with them this course is nearly completed. The plan to provide Catholics in convenient form with brief and reliable expositions of the fundamental Catholic dogmas was a very commendable one, and the editor and writers are to be congratulated that in spite of its difficulty their task has been accomplished in such good time and with such marked success. No. 5 of the Series, which treats of the Holy Ghost and has John M. T. Barton, D.D., Lic.S.Script., as its author, explains the doctrine concerning the Third Person of the Trinity—His divinity, procession, temporal mission, prophetic office—under the various clauses of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. "The Sacrament of the Eucharist," by Geo. D. Smith, Ph.D., D.D., is No. 25 of the Series. It is a brief exposition of Eucharistic dogma and theology, treating the Real Presence, transubstantiation, the manner of Christ's presence, the sacramental character of the Eucharist and its benefits for the communicant. It is no easy task to condense the whole doctrine on the Blessed Sacrament into a statement that covers only 86 small pages; and it is this no doubt that explains certain inaccuracies. Thus, it is not accurate to say that the Council of Trent teaches that transubstantiation is *miraculous* (page 46). The word employed by the Council is *mirabilis*. Strictly, we may designate as miracles only those divine effects that are suited to natural causes (for which reason creation is not a miracle, cfr. *Summa Theol.*, III, Q. cv, art. 7, ad 1) and that happen in an exceptional or unusual manner (for which reason the normal conversion of a sinner is not a miracle, *Summa Theol.*, I-II, Q. cxiii, art. 10), and it cannot be said that transubstantiation is an *effectus natus fieri per causas secundas*, nor that it happens *præter solitum et consuetum ordinem supernaturalem causandi effectum*. Again, since the term *miracle* is properly applied to effects that are manifest but whose causes are hidden, and since transubstantiation is not manifest, as being a mystery of faith, it is not properly classed as a miracle. Yet, though the Council of Trent did not speak of transubstantiation as miraculous, there is no objection to the expression if it be used in an improper or wide sense. St. Thomas himself (*Summa Theol.*, III, Q. xxix, art. 1, ad 2) calls the sacrament of the altar a miracle, though he is careful to draw at the same time the distinction between the miracles that are the arguments for faith and the miracles that are

objects of faith. Another criticism: on page 42 Luther's opinion on the relation of Christ to the elements in the Eucharist is described as impanation (in the bread) or consubstantiation (with the bread). Impanation is now widely, if not generally, used to signify, not the mere presence of Christ in the bread, but the theory of a Eucharistic hypostatic union, such as was taught perhaps by Berengarius and certainly by the Lutheran Osiander, but not by Luther. The statement on page 44 that any system of philosophy that safeguards the distinction between the appearances of a thing and the thing in itself may be reconciled with the dogma of transubstantiation sounds too sweeping, as may be seen from the fact that on page 50 we read that Cartesianism, though it makes the thing objective and the appearances subjective (and the objective and subjective are surely distinct), is uniformly rejected by theologians as near to heresy. And other actual or possible cases that contradict the general statement of the author can readily be thought of: for example, a philosophy that denies the possibility of all change or of supernatural intervention is not reconcilable with transubstantiation, even though it admit the distinction between the thing and its appearances. These criticisms are not meant as any reflection on the knowledge of the author, but they illustrate the difficulty of packing much theology into a brief space. And we think that haste must be responsible for the failure to notice inconsistencies between the introduction and the treatise itself. Thus, pages vi and vii say that transubstantiation is the same thing as transmutations produced by natural causes, that it occurred in the miracle of Cana, while on pages 45 and 46 we read, in a comment on the Council of Trent, that transubstantiation is not only supernatural but unique, having no proper analogy either in the order of nature or in that of grace, and no counterpart, not even in the miracle of Cana.

No. 28 is an explanation of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction by J. P. Arendzen, Ph.D., D.D. The special solemnity and consolation that attach to the sacrament of the sick and the fewness of treatises concerning it make this one of the most interesting and useful volumes of the series. Dr. Arendzen omits nothing of great importance, though he does avoid questions of lesser moment that would not be of help to the general reader. We have noticed a few passages that might be questioned. The inference from the words of the Catechisms of the Council of Trent ("It is a very grievous sin to defer the Holy Unction") that there must be a serious obligation of receiving this Sacrament (pages 49, 50) does not appear to us a sound one. For the Catechism is speaking of the duty of the minister or of those who should send for the priest, and it states that those are guilty of very serious sin who *customarily* put off the Sacrament till the patient's condition is desperate and he is falling into unconsciousness (*qui illud*

tempus observare *solent*). From this it does not follow that there is, *per se*, a grave duty of giving or of receiving Extreme Unction. It is not precise to say that Extreme Unction is intended to remove *all the consequences* of sin (page 58), for though the last anointing takes away the remains of sin, there are certain consequences of sin which not even Baptism entirely puts an end to. On page 66 we read that the sinner who has been anointed is certain of his salvation, but on page 81 it is stated that the reception of Extreme Unction does not amount to a revelation of final salvation. In treating of reviviscence the author says: "Baptism, Confirmation and Orders may be received without due disposition" (page 84). The substitution of "can" for "may" would be an improvement. The unwillingness of the recipient is not the only possible reason for repeating the rite, as is said on pages 51 and 86: a sacrament may be invalid for other reasons.

J. A. McHUGH, O.P.

LITURGY OF THE MASS

The Mass, Its Origin and History is a translation of *La Liturgie de la Messe* by Dom Jean De Puniet, Abbot of St. Paul's, Oosterhout, made by the Benedictines of Stanbrook. The original appeared in 1926, and this authorized English translation is just off the press. It is uncommonly well done. The work is a distinct step forward in the modern liturgical movement. It is written with the clarity, the precision, the completeness of a dissertation for a doctorate. The author has apparently overlooked nothing; there is every evidence of diligent research. He quotes authorities of all periods from the prophecies of Isaias to the writings of Dom Cagin. He adduces frequently the evidence of ancient Sacramentaries, the Leonine, the Gelasian, and the Gregorian. De Sacramentis and the Apostolic Constitutions give clear proof of the antiquity of many prayers and ceremonies used in the Mass. The *Ordines Romani*, particularly the first, the second, the sixth, the fourteenth and the fifteenth, attest the introduction of various usages and forms of words.

The book is no less remarkable for the clear argumentation of the writer. His deductions are always logical, his inferences always plausible. There is none of the far-fetched analogy and strained symbolism that disfigure many works on the Mass. His matter-of-fact method would carry conviction to the mind of an unbeliever. Succinctly, the book traces the historical development of the Eucharistic mystery from its institution at the Last Supper down to the final formation and fixation of the Roman Mass, and then, taking the Eucharistic liturgy as St. Gregory the Great left it, explains the rites and prayers still in use today as clearly and as simply as possible.

After an opening chapter in which he gives a clear idea of the re-

ligious significance of sacrifice and of the relationship of the sacrifices of the Old Testament to the one great sacrifice of the New Testament, the author presents his work in two parts: first, the origin of the Mass from the Last Supper to the Missal of Pope Pius V (1570), and secondly, the development of the Roman Mass in all its parts with all its profound meaning. The author's splendid chapter on the Preface might have been extended by the translator to include the new Prefaces recently approved.

The work is a product of the Benedictine liturgical spirit, the spirit that has given us in America the periodical, *Orate Fratres*, and the research of Dom Sargent and his confreres. To read this book meditatively is to make a spiritual retreat. It is a source book for sermons, a treasury of thought for the preacher. It will edify all classes of the faithful and give a mighty impetus to the liturgical movement and its consequent piety and devotion to Christ in the Eucharist. Can we say more of Dom Puniet's classic treatise in the Stanbrook translation than that it would have been stimulating to the Catholic heart of the great Cardinal Newman who in *Loss and Gain* wrote of the Mass: "To me nothing is so consoling, so piercing, so thrilling, so overcoming, as the Mass, said as it is among us. I could attend Masses forever, and not be tired. It is not a mere form of words—it is a great action, the greatest action that can be on earth."

PAUL E. CAMPBELL, A.M., LITT.D.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

As the world has her classics, so also the Church. It is cause for lament that the great masterpieces of ecclesiastical literature are to so many a hidden treasure. Anything that will make the literary works in which the spirit of the Church has become crystallized better known among the faithful, deserves encouragement. To two laudable efforts in this direction we call the attention of the reader.

The Abbé Bardy speaks entertainingly of the Latin literature of the Church of the first six centuries.¹ There is no need of dwelling on the importance of this brilliant epoch, or of mentioning the shining lights that have shed imperishable lustre on these centuries. The author reviews the writers of this time in a critical yet popular manner, since the book is meant not only for the scholar but for a much wider circle. He writes concerning them in such a way that the reader will be induced to turn to their works, and that really is the best thing a literary history can accomplish.

The outstanding figure of the patristic age, of course, is St. Augus-

¹ *The Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. XII. *The Christian Latin Literature of the First Six Centuries*. By Abbé Bardy. Translated by Mother Mary Reginald, O.P. (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.).

tine, and among his works none is better known than his "Confessions." This little book possesses for all students of religion an undying interest, since it deals with the astounding phenomenon of his conversion. Modern psychologists have pounced upon the remarkable volume to find in it substantiation of their false theories of religious conversion. An analysis of the splendid work, which is more like a prayer than a scientific treatise, is as timely now as ever. Dr. Simpson's study of the fascinating work and of the conversion of the great African Bishop, will, therefore, unfailingly arouse considerable interest.² The author studies in connection with the "Confessions" the other works of the illustrious convert. This is perfectly legitimate, and will add to a better understanding of the "Confessions" themselves. We do not, however, agree with him when he holds that the "Confessions," being written thirteen years after the conversion, do not contain an historical account of this event, but read into it experiences of much later date. Possibly also the author underrates the supernatural influences at work in the transformation wrought in the heart and mind of St. Augustine. It is quite true that natural factors have entered into the conversion, but they are overshadowed by the persuasiveness of Divine Grace. In spite of a certain onesidedness, Dr. Simpson's account of the conversion of the great Latin Father of the Church is very fascinating and eminently instructive.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

AN ARMFUL OF BOOKS

The Parish Visitors' Social Service consists of conferences to the Parish Visitors of Mary Immaculate on the ideals, opportunities, needs and a survey of parish visitation. *Family Meditations on Great Catholic Truths* present a series of daily counsels and applications to meet the personal aspirations and requirements of Catholic families. In *Learning to Live With Christ in The Liturgy*, we meet practical considerations on the Missal arranged for students, parents and teachers. *Conferences on Feasts of the Liturgy* include preparation for Christmas, the Nativity, the Holy Family Holy Week and Easter, Pentecostal and Sacred Heart devotions, and festivals of Mary Immaculate. *The Parish Visitor Missionary* is a series of conferences to the Parish Visitors of Mary Immaculate on motives and principles, character foundations, the apostolate and various missionary qualities. *The Parish Visitor Catechist* presents conferences under the heads of the catechist exhorted, explaining the catechism, important subjects of faith, and bringing the people to God by detailed consideration of the mysteries of the Rosary. All these volumes are by Mother Mary Teresa Tallon,

² *St. Augustine's Conversion. An Outline of His Development to the Time of His Ordination.* By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. (The Macmillan Company, New York City).

foundress and first superior. *The Parish Visitors of Mary Immaculate*, a sketch of the institute. (Vol. 1, 1920-1923), is a history of the beginning, progress and development of the Community during its first four years, including the establishment of Marycrest Novitiate. *Family Instructions in a New Way*, by the Rev. Edward Charles Hearn, is a collection of sermon-essays by "an unpretentious country rector," done "in the dull hours of a lonely parish" but done well. They deal with gratitude, companionship, kindness, vanity, scandal, home, daily life, Lenten and Christmas reflections, original sin, the confessional, indulgences, resurrection, judgment, purgatory and hell. This and all the preceding volumes are published by the Parish Visitors of Mary Immaculate, St. Joseph's Convent, 328 West 71st St., New York City.

Marie Estelle Harpain, adapted from the French of the Abbé Elie Maire by Hersey Wanchope, (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.), tells without undue idealizing a matter-of-fact but refreshing story of one who started life as no infant prodigy, but worked up from childish vanity and priggishness to the heights of infused contemplation and mystical gifts. Her life of twenty-eight years, spent as dressmaker in uninspiring and Jansenistic surroundings undistinguishable from those of her contemporaries, ended in 1842. In her work room at St. Paillais, this contemplative lived the Life she adored in the tabernacle. Called the "Angel of the Blessed Sacrament," she found in It her conception of God, while His risen Life in the Host kept her untouched by the coarseness of the world and brought her to saintliness.

The strangeness of many Catholic doctrines, and "why Catholics do and believe a lot of the things that people wonder about," are explained in an interesting book by a Father J. R. Buck, convert priest (*Why Do Catholics—?* Bruce Publishing Co. Milwaukee, Wis.). The discussion is neither controversial nor speculative, but urbane, rich with anecdote, and carried along by dialogue. The book will be useful for convert classes.

Apologetics, by Paul J. Glenn, Ph.D., S.T.D., is a class manual in philosophy of the Catholic Religion, (B. Herder Book Co.). Before the Catholic can take an aggressive stand in the endless argument about his Faith, he must first as an apologist learn and love his Faith. This book will also impress him with his responsibility to interest others in his religion. The author recognizes that the modern textbook must deal more fully than formerly with the fundamental truths of God's existence and the divinity of Christ, while the claims of the Church may be made more brief because the other Christian bodies have faded into vaguely differentiated negation. He deals with the problems God, Religion, Christ and the Church accordingly, and satisfactorily.

My Sins of Omission, by Jacques Debout, translated by J. F. Scanlan, (B. Herder Book Co.), is an average Catholic's examination of conscience. With decidedly novel viewpoint and cameo-like expression the author maintains that sins of commission have their roots in sins of omission. He chides us gently, pricking sundry self-complacencies, formalisms, snobberies, hypocrisies and insincerities which we permit to encumber the spiritual life. The book is to be read by all of us—that queer tribe who know their practice

differs from their faith, and try to justify it. The chapter on *Listening to Sermons* is perhaps the best.

This year marks the fiftieth anniversary of the first Eucharistic Congress. How remarkably this excellent movement has grown and to what impressive professions of the faith it has given rise need not be outlined here. But we ought not to forget that national Congresses are often quite as important as international Congresses; and to help us to remember this *The Sixth National Eucharistic Congress: Omaha, Nebraska* has been published (The Sentinel Press, New York City). The book affords a complete record of events, supplies the text of all the lectures and discussions, and reprints in both facsimile and translation the letter with which the Sovereign Pontiff honored the occasion. While the format is not pretentious, many illustrations add to the readableness of a volume, which is virtually a composite treatise on the Holy Eucharist as the Source and Center of Christian life.

The number of books about the Liturgy has increased considerably, but no store of them would be complete without Dom Ildefons Herwegen's modest little brochure, *The Art Principle of the Liturgy*. Translated from the German by Dr. William Busch, it is published as No. 6 of the excellent *Popular Liturgical Library* being issued by the Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota. Dom Ildefons, who is of course Abbot of Maria-Laach, notes first that "the fact is that as the Church grew the Liturgy did develop and did become a supreme work of art," and then finds the explanation for this magnificent phenomenon in the truth that "the idea of Christian transfiguration is the art-principle of the Liturgy." We cannot outline the argument here. With the help of the sacred texts and of history the author arrives at his interesting conclusion: "The Liturgy itself is the principle of the Christian art of life. It produces that divine life which assimilates us to the eternal Logos."

The Homiletic and Pastoral Review

Vol. XXXI

SEPTEMBER, 1931

No. 12

PASTORALIA

The Spirit of the Seminary

More than once in the course of these articles it has been emphasized that success in convert-making, as in every other field of pastoral endeavor, is primarily dependent, not on exceptional scholarship nor on the familiarity with any special technique, but on spiritual and moral qualities and particularly on zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. This is almost axiomatic and requires no further demonstration. It would be labor lost to waste argument on this point, concerning which agreement among the spiritual writers is unanimous. The seminary, therefore, that turns out genuinely spiritual and zealous priests, by the same token also produces priests who will be successful in every department of pastoral work, and consequently likewise in the work of gaining converts. It is not necessary to belittle other qualifications and to neglect them; withal, the chief requisites for fruitful activity in the sacred ministry remain spirituality and zeal. A zealous priesthood is what the Church needs; with such a priesthood she can accomplish wonderful results and convert the world. Without it the hands of the Spouse of Christ are sadly tied. In a zealous priesthood resides the glory as well as the power of the Church. Hence, it has always been the particular and anxious care of the Church to prepare unto herself a priesthood devoted to high spiritual ideals and animated by true zeal.

The main objective, therefore, of the seminary must be to foster the spiritual life in the candidates for the priesthood and to produce men who are actuated by the highest supernatural motives and prepared to spend themselves without stint and without selfish calculations in the service of God and for the good of souls. Men who

have their eyes fixed on temporal rewards will never accomplish much for the cause of God and souls. They will engage in activities that strike the eye and secure external recognition and public applause. They will turn away from work that is not surrounded with glory and glamor and that will find its reward only in the next life. They will shun sacrifices and shrink from labor. Convert-making is work of the inglorious and humble type that mostly goes without recognition, brings no material remuneration, and rarely leads to external honors. The path of the apostle and convert-maker is not the path of glory. Of the apostles and convert-makers the Psalmist says: "Euntes ibant et flebunt, mittentes semina sua."¹ Such work does not appeal to those who seek themselves and strive after the prizes this world offers. No one will undertake such work unless he has learned to look upon things with a spiritual eye and to evaluate everything according to its eternal and supernatural value.

Training for convert-making, accordingly, means training in true spirituality, in unselfishness, in self-effacement, in purity of intention, in ardent love of God and in disinterested love of souls. If the seminary instills these lofty sentiments into the heart of the young cleric, it has done its work well and need entertain no misgivings about his success in the priestly career. But if it has not done this, it has hardly done anything. The rest does not count without spirituality and zeal, for men who are not imbued with the spiritual outlook on the world and not inspired with supernatural zeal will only perform the routine tasks of the pastoral ministry and nothing more. They will not add to their official duties (which can be discharged without too much interference with their comfort) the additional labor of seeking and gaining converts. Their attitude towards their work will be that of the functionary who is well satisfied with himself when he has done that which his office strictly requires.²

¹ Ps. cxxv. Cardinal Vaughan writes a beautiful commentary on these words: "The characteristic of the Apostolic life consists, not in triumphs, but in labors and sufferings undertaken out of love for Jesus Christ. . . . Without strong love for Christ there can be no strong and constant labor in His service" ("The Young Priest," London).

² "There are two ways in which we can fulfil the obligations we have taken upon ourselves in seeking and accepting priest's orders. We can undertake the work which lies before us as a profession or as a vocation. In each case we can fulfil our obligations honorably. The difference lies rather in our attitude towards our duties than in the amount of work done. If we regard our priesthood as our

Worldliness, every species of commercialism, attachment to the good things of this life and to their symbol, money, and love of comfort and ease must be weeded out from the heart of the seminarian or his priestly career will be blighted and cursed with barrenness. Nothing poisons the soul of the priest more radically than the mercenary spirit. Nothing is more incompatible with missionary zeal. Nothing so completely undermines a priest's usefulness in the care of souls. If he is tainted with this fell disease, his life will have to be written down as a disastrous failure in spite of certain creditable external achievements.³

Upon spirituality and piety and unworldliness the Church has always insisted as essential to the priest, and has therefore demanded that the seminary give due attention to this vital phase of priestly training. Recent papal decrees bearing on seminary training merely reaffirm the old traditions which the Church has always observed in the education of the clergy. Dr. A. M. Micheletti shows how solicitous the Church has ever been about the spiritual training of her priests: "*Nec aliter Tridentina Synodus suam mentem expromit ubi testatur huc in Seminariorum institutione omnino ut, videlicet, dignos altaribus sanctis ministros, populo autem Dei veri nominis apostolos compararet. Iamvero ambiget nemo tales numquam sacerdotes ac Dei ministros exstituros nisi qui vera imbuantur sanc-*

profession, we shall carry out the duties laid upon us while at the same time our interests may be far away. If our priest's work is to us a vocation, we shall refuse to put limits to our work or to distinguish what is of obligation and what is not, we shall say *humani nil a me alienum puto*, and our embrace will be as wide as the range of human misery" (Canon Keatinge, "The Priest, His Character and Work," New York City).

³ The high ideals of unselfish service set before the aspirant to the Protestant ministry will shame many a candidate for the Catholic priesthood whose motives remain on a low level and who is actuated by sordid self-interest. We quote from *The North American Review* (June, 1931), in which the Rev. Chas. A. Jefferson writes as follows: "There is in the United States at the present time no more attractive and promising field open to a man fitted for moral leadership and desirous of making his life count for the most than that which is offered by the Christian ministry. . . . Here is opportunity for men of capacious brain and intrepid spirit. What can the church accomplish without daring and disciplined and masterful leaders? If a young man is ambitious to make money, let him keep away from the ministry. If he craves short hours and an easy time, let him never think of entering the pulpit. The Christian pulpit is for indefatigable workers. The way of the Christian minister is now, as always, the way of the Cross. The need for industry and courage and sacrifice in the American pulpit was never greater than now. The hour challenges the very best in the men who are strongest. Weaklings can do nothing. Slackers are a curse. The work is so manifest and so arduous that it taxes every faculty of the soul. It is a task which calls for every ounce of a man's body and mind and spirit" ("The Ministry").

titate, ea scilicet quam diuturnam ac sapiens pietatis tirocinium parere consuevit, cuius ope et virtute tantummodo alumni sacrorum veterem hominem exuere et in iuventutem Spiritus Dei renovari queunt, adeo ut ipsius Sancti Spiritus impulsu agant quidquid cogitent, loquantur, operentur. Sacerdotem perfectum illum tantummodo esse prædicandum cuius ad vitæ sanctitatem doctrinæ quoque laus accedat concedimus libenter, quippe qui non sibimetipsi tantum utilis verum ac multo magis etiam aliis sit profuturus. . . . Nihilominus idem contendimus perniciosam omnino et usque ad extremam sui aliorumque perniciem esse illius sacerdotis doctrinam in quo vitæ sanctitas non pari passu cum doctrina ambulet, immo doctrinam ipsam non antegrediatur. . . . Ad dignos Domini sacerdotes instituendos præter doctrinam diligentior requiritur clericalis institutio, qua deficiente actio cleri populo pæne inefficax est.”⁴

APOSTOLIC ZEAL

In speaking of the part which Pastoral Theology can play in preparing the young priest for the work of convert-making, we have frequently referred to the virtue of zeal. There, however, we had to do with the orientation and practical application of this virtue. Its existence was taken for granted. Now we are concerned with its genesis. To arouse zeal in the soul of the seminarian is the concern of those who are directly entrusted with his spiritual training. The new regulations have created a special office for this purpose, not indeed to exempt the other members of the faculty from all responsibility in the matter, but to fix the responsibility more definitely and thus to make sure that this work of transcendent importance shall be done in a systematic manner. It is the office of the spiritual director and the disciplinarians to see that the souls of the aspirants to Holy Orders are adorned with the virtues required

⁴“De Regimine Ecclesiastico Religiosorum necnon Seminariorum” (Rome). Speaking of the virtues required in the priest Pius X stresses the necessity of self-denial: “And here We may appropriately point out that the most prudent Pontiff (Leo XIII) made special mention of abstinence, which in the words of the Gospel we call self-denial. The strength, the power, and the fruit of the priestly office is truly found in this virtue, beloved sons, and from its neglect springs whatever in the life of a priest offends and injures the souls of the faithful. If he works for the love of money, if he is immersed in worldly business, if he seeks the first place and despises others, if he yields to flesh and blood, if he strives to please men, if he trusts in the persuasive words of human wisdom, in all this he has neglected and spurned the Commandment of Christ: If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself” (Letter to Priests).

by the dignity of the state to which they are called. Of course, it is also their duty to make sure that every young priest leaving the seminary possesses that measure of zeal without which he will not live up to the exacting demands of the pastoral office.

Zeal is not an isolated and detached virtue. It is rather the flowering and the fruit of other virtues, notably of faith and charity. The nature of our zeal bespeaks the fundamental orientation of the entire soul. We are zealous for the things we love. Our zeal betrays us and shows where our heart is. Hence, the Lord said: "For where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also."⁵ Zeal is the emanation of love, and extends to the things we hold dear. As there is no warmth where there is no fire, so there is no zeal where there is no love. The poet has well said:⁶

That man loves not who is not zealous too.

Zeal cannot be inculcated from without, but is the natural resultant of the whole spiritual attitude of the soul. It can be cultivated only in an indirect manner. This does not mean that it cannot be fostered deliberately and effectively. The growth of a plant is promoted by furnishing the soil with the elements which it needs for its development. So also zeal can be made to blossom forth in the soul of the cleric and be stimulated to unfold to full and rich expansion, if this soul is steeped in a supernatural atmosphere and filled with the love of God. If the seminarian learns to love God and to place first in his estimation the imperishable things of eternity, if his heart is indifferent to the objects which the world prizes most highly, if he has a proper understanding of the value of an immortal soul and realizes what a glorious privilege it is to be instrumental in the saving of souls, if he loves Christ and reflects on the enormous price which He paid for the redemption of souls, if he vividly pictures to himself what eternal damnation means and ponders that it is in his power to save men from that awful destiny, if he considers

⁵ Matt., vi. 21.

⁶ Herrick, "Zeal Required in Love." Poetry and Theology here are in perfect accord, for St. Thomas also says: "Respondeo dicendum quod zelus, quocumque modo sumitur, ex intensione amoris provenit" (*Summa Theologica*, I-II, Q. xxviii, art. 4). Therefore, if a man loves souls ardently, he will do everything to remove from them whatever menaces their true welfare, ignorance and sin. Like St. Paul, he will burn with an unquenchable desire to snatch them from perdition. In this pursuit he will count no sacrifice too great and know no weariness.

that there is no work more pleasing to God and more meritorious than laboring for the salvation of souls, apostolic zeal will be as natural to him as the scent is to the flower and the diffusion of light and warmth to the sun. Let the seminary surround the future priest with such a supernatural atmosphere and implant in his heart contempt for the things of the world, and he will go forth to his work with the zeal of a true apostle. But on a worldly, self-seeking, pleasure-loving soul you can graft zeal no more than you can make a seed force its roots into solid rock. Everything, therefore, depends on the spirit, the prevailing spiritual atmosphere, of the seminary.⁷

Disinterested service of souls must be the ideal of the Catholic priest. It is this lofty ideal that the Right Rev. Francis Clement Kelley sets before his students in a letter addressed to them: "You are being made fit for the responsibility of ministering to souls redeemed by the Precious Blood of Christ. . . . You are the slaves of the Lord, the guards of His house, the servants He will send into the lanes and the byways to compel men to come in. . . . Souls are the talents you must multiply during the days of your stewardship. One thought only must be yours for the future, the winning of souls for God. . . . The first and most necessary virtue that you should try to make part of your very selves is that all-embracing virtue called Charity. Out of that virtue comes zeal for the glory of your Father and a deep sense of your obligations to all His children. Without Charity you will fail in your mission, but with Charity you will succeed. . . . Cultivating in you the seeds of this virtue, see the world and its teeming millions who could be a thousand times happier for the message you have to carry to them. Think of the miseries that message can alleviate. Think of the black sins it has the power to blot out. Think of the sicknesses it can heal. Think of the hope

⁷ From a recent memorandum we quote the following: "The attitude of seminarians during their course should be missionary—not merely functionary. The missionary attitude is a reflection of the spirit of the institution. A smug, self-satisfied attitude on the part of seminarians looking forward to a comfortable living, ministering as functionaries to a people who provide a generous support, in a word, the typical institutional outlook gives promise of dry-rot in the exercise of the sacred ministry. It is the opposite of the apostolic spirit, and it is the greatest danger to which ecclesiastical seminaries are exposed. It is consistent with every outward appearance of decorum and excellence. It is inconsistent only with the purposes for which ecclesiastical seminaries exist. The seminary must create a missionary spirit in its candidates for the priesthood. . . . The seminary faculty will have to give the inspiration" ("Catholic Evidence Work in the United States. A Survey of Its Status and of Its Prospects").

it can impart. Do not think of the cost to you in comfort, money or fame that your going forth with it may imply. Think only of the opportunities God will give you to be useful to Him and to be true physicians for the cure of evils afflicting the souls of men.”⁸ Dull and dead is the soul in which the thought of saving the stray sheep of the Lord and leading them back into the arms of the Good Shepherd, who loves them so tenderly, cannot create the capacity for heroic self-sacrifice.

Certainly, the seminary must cultivate the highest ideals of unselfish service and war incessantly against the mercenary spirit that is the deadly enemy of these ideals. With full justice Dr. John Talbot Smith says: “This qualification is the life of all others. Without it the priest is a mere business or professional man. It is the spirit of the true disciple of Christ, ready for sacrifice, any labor, any hardship. Its great enemy with the secular clergy is routine training in the seminary and worldly ambitions in the world. . . . With too many seminarians the spirit of the civil-service clerk is strong. It is the spirit of personal comfort and advancement. A good curacy, a fair parish at the right moment, a better one later on, the best as soon as possible after—these are the matter of their meditations. An intelligent love and right understanding of the spiritual life they have not. They may make good machine men, enterprising, popular, correct, but they will have to be paid for it. They will shirk hard places, and they will form the chief obstacle to the work of the apostolic man.”⁹ It may be admitted that there are students who answer to this description. In justice to our present-day seminaries the insinuation that they form a majority must be repudiated. The young priest coming from the seminary is rarely a mercenary, self-seeking and calculating individual. In most cases he has caught something of the spirit of Christ and enters upon his career with a high idealism. But this idealism may be killed by the chilly blasts of untoward experiences in his early priestly life. He who comes with high ideals may find low standards and egotism among his older fellow-priests, and his zeal may not be proof against such disillusionment.

⁸ Pastoral Letter to the Ecclesiastical Students for the Diocese of Oklahoma, 1925. No lesser motive than the love of God and zeal for the salvation of souls will suffice to brace the young priest against the shocks and disillusionments which no one will be spared.

⁹ “The Training of a Priest” (New York City).

And here is another thought. If the blight of worldliness and the killing frost of the mercenary spirit have invaded a seminary, whence have they come? It must not be forgotten that the seminary cannot escape the influence of its environment. The seminary reflects the spirit of its environment; by a thousand crevices this spirit, whether good or bad, seeps into the atmosphere of the seminary. The responsibility for the proper formation of the younger clergy, therefore, though primarily, does not rest exclusively with the seminary. If all realize their share in the solidaric responsibility for the formation of the rising generation of priests and conscientiously do their part, the Church will be blessed with a priesthood equal to all ordinary as well as extraordinary tasks.

LIFT UP YOUR EYES¹⁰

Exceptional opportunities call for exceptional efforts. When the rich harvests of the field beckon, the husbandman multiplies his labors to garner without loss what heaven has so kindly bestowed. In those days he knows no rest, and work encroaches on the hours ordinarily devoted to sleep and recreation, for delay may be fatal.

The world seems ripe for a spiritual harvest. Everywhere the Church is meeting the splendid opportunity. In all countries of the globe new missionary interest is stirring. Supreme efforts are being made lest the harvest perish on the fields. No country offers a more promising field for the harvester of the Lord than America. The call of this magnificent field is loud and insistent. The Church of America will not miss the unique opportunity. It will send forth an army of laborers, priests and laymen, well equipped with the necessary knowledge and inspired with zeal, to gather in the precious sheaves which will delight the heart of the Divine Husbandman. There will be abundant labor, for the workmen are few and the field is extensive. But however arduous the labor may be, the harvest itself will be a wonderful reward.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

¹⁰ John, iv. 35.

PREACHING ON IMPURITY

By THE RIGHT REV. MSGR. H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

I

"Now the works of the flesh," wrote St. Paul to the Galatians, "are manifest, which are, fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury," and others which he names. Will the Epistle of the Fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost induce us to preach on Impurity? A previous paper ventured to suggest that Purity would be a better theme than Impurity.

Nevertheless, *audi alteram partem* is a safe and sane plea, if for no other reason than that "the other side" may have its day in court and mayhap find its arguments adequately answered in detail. Such, at any rate, is the hope behind the present paper.

"The works of the flesh are manifest," declares the Apostle. They were very much so in his own day and generation. They remain so, in a specially obnoxious fashion, in our own day. Pornography is everywhere. We have the "filthy" moving-pictures against which a committee of officers of the American Navy protested vehemently as menacing the morale of their seamen. We can hardly read the newspapers without seeing the advertisements displaying not only the undergarments of women, but even, in the rotogravure section of the Sunday papers, the wholly undraped female form (apologetically declared to be the reproduction of some recent work of art). All the lovely and wellnigh immemorial reticences of life have been cast to the winds. Why should we try to keep up the pretense of delicacy in the pulpit?

Now, there have been notable sermons preached directly on the subject of Impurity by famous preachers. Bourdaloue preached what Fougère styles a "terrible" sermon. Dargan, in his "History of Preaching," makes room for an analysis of that sermon, but styles it "timely, courageous, and impressive." Massillon took up the same theme in his sermon on the Prodigal Son, and O'Mahony translates that portion of the sermon in his "Great French Preachers." St. Bernardine of Siena preached on the same theme, and his biographers, Howell and Thureau-Dangin, comment upon his manner of

treatment. Such excellent preachers are names to conjure with, and their sermons are on record. Why, then, should counsel be given to preach rather on Purity than on its opposite vice? Had not these great and holy men to face a condition similar to that which confronts us today? Was not the condition, indeed, the declared apology for a treatment of vice?

It is true that, as Dargan remarks, Bourdaloue's sermon "was provoked by an atrocious crime in high life, and Bourdaloue could not keep silence before the court." Massillon quotes as his text the words of St. Paul concerning the manifest works of the flesh, and pleads that, if necessity did not require it, the subject ought not so much as to be named among Christians: "But in these days," he forthwith continues, "when this detestable vice has extended its ravages over the whole Christian world, desolated the fair inheritance of Jesus, and pervaded the inmost recesses of that Church which had formerly banished it from its precincts, you will readily allow that it is the duty of the pastor to raise his voice, and openly oppose its progress. I will therefore display before you the pernicious effects which it entails on its unhappy victims; I will show you that no vice removes the sinner to a greater distance from God; that no vice more completely closes every avenue to repentance; and that no vice makes the sinner more insupportable to himself, or more contemptible in the sight of men." St. Bernardine wishes that mothers should bring their married daughters to hear him preach on that topic; and, when he preached against the sin that brought down fire from heaven to consume the ancient cities of the plain, he laments that he cannot have a larger audience.

II

A fair answer to such an argument as might be based on examples like these could properly be that, when we preach on Purity, we are of course treating, albeit indirectly, of the opposite vice in its exceedingly varied forms of sinfulness. But now these sins are lumped together in one hideous whole rather than detailed in a possibly suggestive manner that may either stimulate the imagination in an unworthy way or teach evil to innocent souls.

However, another answer might be had from an examination of the methods employed by the great preachers mentioned above. Even

if we directly speak of Impurity, we can by our whole manner of address obviously make the vice appear wholly loathsome in all of its ramifications. On the other hand, it is quite possible that our words and manner alike may appear to our auditory both light and trivial if we essay anything remotely like a humorous treatment. But if we formally speak on Purity, there is much less likelihood of our yielding to anything approaching levity.

It is worthy of note that the Protestant historian of preaching, Rev. Edwin C. Dargan, who was quick to comment adversely upon the burlesque or trivial manner of preaching, finds only words of commendation for Bourdaloue's sermon. And Massillon, after making the fourfold division I have referred to above (and before entering upon any development of the points), forthwith prays in these impressive words: "Do Thou purify my lips, O God: and in my description of the excesses of the voluptuous inspire me with expressions which may leave untarnished the beauty of a virtue whose reign I hope to promote in their souls. Inspire me, I beseech Thee; for the deeper the world is engulfed in the mire of impurity, the more are *circumspection and delicacy demanded of us* when we dare to draw the veil and expose the vileness of this besetting sin." I have italicized his thought that, the more besmirched his auditory is, the greater must his circumspection and delicacy be. And, as a simple reading of his sermon will demonstrate, he does not detail the sins of impurity, but only the many fearful results they attain to in moral and physical degeneration. In this respect it is, like that of Bourdaloue, a "terrible" sermon.

A different manner of treatment stares us in the face, however, when we consider the example of St. Bernardine of Siena. This example might be brought forward against what has been said thus far. It can hardly be ignored in a discussion such as the present one. Indeed, it may justly claim a separate section to itself.

III

It is true that a captious critic will seize avidly upon any supposed flaw in a sermon. We are protected against his animadversions neither by our holy ministry nor by our personal rectitude in conduct. His complaints, we conclude, may simply be disregarded. Nevertheless, we should not needlessly give such a critic an opening for un-

pleasant comment. It is true that St. Bernardine was the object of criticism in his own day because of his great plainness in discussing not only matters concerning purity in general, but even marital questions of a delicate nature.

In his *Life of the Saint*, Thureau-Dangin gives a humorous illustration of a sermon by the Saint on the love of husband and wife, in which the domestic difficulties that occasionally arise between them are pictured in telling fashion. But the biographer hereupon continues: "It were impossible to follow our Saint in his further treatment of this delicate subject, in his dealings with the most intimate and subtle points of conscience connected with married life and handled by him with a frankness unknown to the modern reader. Far be it from us, however, to insinuate this conduct on the part of our pure and saintly friar to have arisen from any kind of delight in questionable topics, when it was in reality prompted exclusively by zeal for the salvation of souls in peril of damnation."

The biographer's point of view is, of course, exactly correct. We may nevertheless experience an uneasy chill in reading his quite unnecessary way of expressing that view. He might more properly, I think, have said that the circumstances of the times, the customs of popular speech, the ignorance of the people in respect to marital duties, possibly the carelessness or the insufficient instruction of the confessors of the time, made such plainness necessary or at least excusable. The Saint could best judge and evaluate the exigencies of the occasion. However, the biographer continues to show the Saint's wonderful spirit of zeal: "On such topics, moreover, he desires to be heard by all the confessors of the town, and has a bench placed specially at their disposal. When some of his audience appear scandalized and ready to quarrel with the boldness of his attitude, he evinces neither surprise nor perturbation and remains convinced that he is doing his duty. 'Do you know why I speak to you of such matters?' he asks. 'I do so for your good. Perhaps you are meanwhile saying to yourselves, "Oh! his words exhale a stench which penetrates to my very brain."' I reply that this, to my mind, is no stench, but rather the best perfume in the world.' He therefore exhorts his audience to pay heed to his words without taking scandal thereat: *senza scandalo e con fede*. He, on his part, promises to flavor his speech with discretion."

If we lived in his times, preached to his auditories, confronted moral—or, say rather, abnormally immoral—conditions such as he confronted, and if the confessors of our day needed the instructions which he gave, we might well, no doubt, employ a freedom of utterance such as he vindicated to himself. Times change, and we change with them. Not in our Catholic lives, our manners or our morals, or in our speech, are the two epochs similar. Our congregations are notably less rude, better instructed. Conversational speech is more refined. Confessors know their art well after many years of training in ecclesiastical seminaries.

But let us hear Thureau-Dangin further in this matter: "The modern public would doubtless be still more aghast at another of our Saint's discourses, devoted entirely to combating the infamous vice which, in days gone by, had called down God's anger upon Sodom, and to which Italy was then a helpless prey. Legal measures were, indeed, forcibly enacted to suppress the same; yet Beccadelli, styled the Panormita, a writer of evil repute, held in high esteem by the princes and humanists of the day, actually sang its praises in one of his works. This will suffice to explain why Bernardine deemed it an imperative necessity to probe this festering wound with the fiery sword of eloquence, while it likewise accounts for his wish, on this occasion, for a specially large audience. 'I would,' such are his opening words, 'that this sermon might cost me half a pound of blood, and also that today were Sunday, so that more people might come to hear me.' "

From this lengthy excerpt it seems clear that the Saint, whilst feeling the urgent need of plain speaking, nevertheless prefaced his discourse with apologetic declarations. He would gladly shed his blood to avoid speaking, yet withal wished for the largest possible of audiences. He exhorts his hearers not to take scandal at the plainness of his speech, since they absolutely needed the kind of instruction he was about to give. Let them consider a most horrid sin under the light which their Catholic faith casts upon our earthly pilgrimage.

A further apology for the Saint's manner of speaking is given by Howell, whose single paragraph devoted to this subject may profitably be quoted in full: "Against sexual immorality and unnatural vice (terribly prevalent in those days) Bernardino preached freely,

though with extreme reluctance, and only on compulsion of duty. The nineteenth, twentieth, twenty-first, and thirty-ninth of the Siena Sermons furnish remarkable examples of the discreet handling of most difficult matters; though his plain speaking would not be tolerated in a modern pulpit, and even in that not over-squeamish age some of his hearers were, or affected to be, scandalized by it. There is, however, reason to think that the complaints came from persons whose sins the preacher has denounced."

Instead of finding a refuge in the example of plain speech given to us by St. Bernardine of Siena, the modern preacher on sexual vice might rather take seasonable warning. The ordinary preacher will not flatter himself that he is comparable to the Saint, either in eloquence or in sanctity. And he will also reflect that the ways of the modern pulpit are different from those of the medieval pulpit. Circumstances alter cases, as our proverbial wisdom reminds us.

We may also remind ourselves of another consideration. The priest, like the physician, is forced by his studies to probe deeply into human nature. It may be true—as a professor of moral theology once remarked to me—that physicians have somehow learned to speak plainly to women without offense to their modesty or sense of delicacy. The priest may be at a disadvantage here. His constant readings of Scripture, of the Fathers of the Church, and of moral theologians, have tended to make him desire plainness and clearness in instructing penitents and in preaching sermons, and have furnished his vocabulary with plain words. He may forget that, with a background which features plainness in theology and in mystical symbolism (*e.g.*, in the *Canticle of Canticles*) alike, his congregation probably knows little about that background plainness of speech, and meanwhile may have learned only indifferently well how to discipline a wandering imagination. Our people may accordingly be shocked, however unreasonably, at diction which is in itself appropriate and legitimate.

PROBLEMS OF THE CHURCH IN GERMANY

By GEORGE N. SHUSTER

In a paper written for the last issue of this REVIEW, I attempted to give some impression of the Church in Germany as its own leaders see it. The thought then suggested itself that some discussion of the peculiar position in which the Catholic body has been placed might prove interesting and valuable. Perhaps an anecdote may serve as a convenient starting point. An American journalist, who wished to acquire information regarding plans to effect fiscal reform in Prussia, went to see the three most eminent authorities. When asked if he had succeeded, he replied: "They didn't agree on anything, but each one knew he was absolutely right." That is an exaggeration, but it does characterize the psychology of a people shaken to the roots by the catastrophe of the War. Perhaps no one thing about this psychology is so important as a loss of confidence in the existing leadership, especially in politics.

Since the Catholics in Germany are organized as a political party—*i.e.*, the Center—the Church is necessarily affected by the crisis thus indicated. The results are chiefly of two kinds. First, the bishops themselves are often compelled to take a stand on public issues, and to make a declaration binding on the Party and to some extent on the electorate. Perhaps the most significant instances are the condemnation of Socialism, the opposition to the secularization of the property of the former princes, and the repudiation of Hitlerism. We may take for granted here the rightness of these decisions, since it would be fatuous of an American spectator to set himself up as a critic of the German hierarchy. But large numbers of Catholics in the Reich dissent from the views of the bishops, and of course the outside public is more or less hostile to them. Secondly, the Center Party as an institution is, of course, a great credit to the Church when things are going well. No one can overestimate the influence of such personalities as Dr. Marx and Dr. Bruening upon the general estimate of Catholicism as a cultural and national force. Such men, exemplary private citizens as well as gifted statesmen, win the respect of even those who oppose them. But, on the other hand, criticism of the party is also likely to involve

criticism of the Church. Every political mistake, every semblance of favoritism, may have a repercussion upon religious sentiment.

All this means that Catholics have a great host of enemies motivated chiefly by political passion. Generally speaking, however, the antagonism of rabid atheists is of no very great importance. Free-thinkers have increased in number since the War, but their growth has been more than compensated for by the waning of materialism and monism in university scholarship. Thus, the chief source from which free-thought derives sustenance has in great measure dried up. Nor is Jewish influence so weighty a matter as it is often thought to be. There is a wave of anti-Semitism among some groups of Catholics, who accuse Jewish citizens of thriving by cultural media (the press and the theatre) which foster immorality and religious indifference. This view is in some instances correct, but there are many good, intelligent Jews whose attitude towards the Church is one of marked friendliness. No, the main body of those who dislike the Catholic position in Germany must still be sought among Protestants. Here we must, of course, distinguish very carefully. Forty million Lutherans and twenty million Catholics cannot live side by side without establishing helpful contacts. Large and prominent groups in both cooperate in social, intellectual and even political tasks. Inside the Christian-National labor unions both confessions work for a common cause. The charity endeavors of the two Churches are also interrelated, and far more parity in educational circles exists today than was noticeable before the War.

But Protestant Germany, which has no single political organization, pretty well forms the strength of three parties. The first is monarchical, believing in the restoration of the Emperor, in a strong national policy, and at least relatively in the adoption of a religion by the State. The second is social-minded, clinging in part to the dicta of Social Democracy and in part to a more conservative program. The third is extremist—the movement led by Adolf Hitler, the picturesque demagogue, who wishes to set in motion something like a *levée en masse* against “foreign domination” as expressed in the Young Plan and the Treaty of Versailles. If to date the Center Party has been the chief bulwark against control of Germany by extremists, the reason is that it has, to a marked extent,

made common cause with the second group. But it is an open question—certainly one I should not care to decide—whether the future does not belong to the other two. Everything depends upon what sort of international action is employed to mitigate the effect of depression in Germany. If this action peters out into mere “control” of the nation’s finances by bankers, radical reaction can be put down only at the cost of civil and possibly European war.

This possibility, which there is not time to analyse here, might prove extremely grave to the Church in Germany, which has voiced its opposition to the reactionary movement in no uncertain terms and which has been a target for that movement during several years. For my part, however, I do not believe that a nationalistic wave such as the one described would mean more than a temporary setback for Catholicism. On the other hand, the triumph of Communism, to the support of which more than four million voters pledged themselves at the last election, would imply genuine religious disaster. Such a triumph is, however, not likely. We live in a time when the trend of events is unpredictable, and when Europe in particular cannot tell whether the reigning political weather will last twenty-four hours. Nevertheless, the signs in Germany point less to an anti-religious Marxism than to a religiously motivated Fascism. And it is of this last that the majority of thoughtful German Catholics think with concern.

The Church is, to be sure, outwardly and inwardly stronger than it was prior to 1914. It has, to begin with, acquired a larger share of general cultural leadership. Virtually all the universities now have a number of Catholic professors some of whom—for example, Romano Guardini at Berlin—lecture on religious subjects. There is some dearth of satisfactory candidates for available positions, owing largely to the official disadvantage under which Catholics lived in the days of the Hohenzollerns. But the *Akademikerverband* and the *Görresgesellschaft*, which band together educators, scholars and professional men loyally interested in the welfare of the Church, have memberships numbering many thousands and programs of action at which the American spectator can only stare in respectful envy. Similarly, the ranks of officialdom have admitted hundreds of Catholics since the War. Many and many an important post has ceased to be identified with the old Prussian upper caste. Finally,

Catholic literary and journalistic work has earned merited esteem. A corps of writers and experts in all fields has been developed.

Inwardly Catholic life is noticeably flourishing. Drawing great strength from its adherence to a single doctrine and tradition, the Church has trained so many people in the same way during such a number of generations that family life is rooted in its spirit far more deeply than in the spirit of any other institution. A definite reverence for "old custom" is therefore characteristic of the Catholic people, and comes to the surface in such practices as the "singing Mass"—that is, a Mass at which congregational singing of hymns in the vernacular accompanies the liturgy. In not a few rural sections a markedly patriarchal attitude towards life prevails; and I was assured by several clergymen in Silesia that this was so important a matter in their estimation that they deliberately fostered traditional peasant customs and dress. Several more or less active movements have likewise made a powerful appeal to Catholic reflection. The new concern with the Liturgy (as sponsored by the Benedictines of Maria-Laach and Beuron), the "Youth Movement" (which in several phases at least championed a measure of spiritually motivated asceticism), the popularizing of retreats and of Frequent Communion—these and other developments have done incalculable good.

On the other hand, the "religious revolution" which immediately followed the War and which, though it ran parallel to a trend to anti-religion among returning soldiers, brought many illustrious converts into the Church, has noticeably waned. Most careful observers say that young Germany is no longer seriously busy with religious search, being apparently quite willing to accept the faith into which it was born, whether that be Catholic or Lutheran. Conversions still take place, but with less frequency and excitement. Similarly, the so-called "high church" movement inside Lutheranism has virtually come to a halt. Protestantism has revived its own ritual, built around such treasures as the music of Bach, or has incorporated distinctly theosophic elements. I believe that the Lutheran discipline is less exposed to forces of dissolution than it was twelve years ago. This fact is probably due, in part, to a marked waning of liberalism and a greater confidence in the authenticity of the Scriptures.

No doubt the greatest opportunity for the Church lies in the fostering of social welfare. The interest taken by many German priests and bishops in economic and industrial problems has been criticized on the ground that the emphasis is being removed from the supernatural to the natural. These remarks would, however, apply with equal force to the achievement of the Church after the fall of the Roman Empire. At any rate, the Catholic has no choice. He cannot dodge either the obligation of charity or the basis of the moral order. Let us take a look at both. Take, for example, the too little known exodus of more than 5,000 German peasants out of Soviet Russia during 1929. These people arrived at the border in absolute poverty, and it was necessary for Catholic and Lutheran welfare agencies to care for them somehow. The work done in their behalf was not only genuinely heroic, when one bears in mind the trials which harass Germany itself, but also profoundly Christian. Secondly, there is the difficult morality of family life. Dearth of housing—myriads of one-room dwellings, thousands of cellars which must serve as homes—and dearth of employment have robbed great sections of the populace of confidence and have led to wholesale postponement of marriage and to birth control. Abortion is hardly a crime in Germany today, especially since guilty physicians have been acquitted in a number of sensational trials. The Church realizes that moods of despair only too frequently render individuals deaf to ethical counsel. We in the United States have confronted similar problems during the past two years of business depression, but large sections of the German people have been “bled white” during nearly twenty years.

All this has spurred earnest Catholics to intense activity. There is a vast and watchful caritative organization, and outside its limits individuals do all they can to alleviate distress and mitigate bitterness. Nevertheless, the problem has not been solved, cannot at present be solved, even in the ranks of the clergy themselves. The conditions under which a goodly number of priests live and work, remind one of pioneer days in America. I shall give just one instance. The suburb of Berlin known as Neukölln is inhabited for the most part by workingmen and their families. Communism has a strong grip on large groups, and in times of especial stress virtually dominates the community. Two Catholic centers have been

established, however, in the very heart of the suburb. One is a little church, administered by a splendid priest who is in a sense missionary to the district. He has opened two missions, one more than fifteen miles from his residence. To this he travels either on the street-car or on foot after a train ride. Quite resignedly he told me that some day he hoped to acquire a little automobile; but since the cheapest make costs about five hundred dollars, he would have to wait some ten years to save that much. Nor is this an isolated case. Pioneer missionary conditions exist in Germany, owing in part to tremendous migrations of workers which have followed the War and in part to the progress of radicalism.

The second center was a day nursery and school for children, founded and conducted by Carmelite nuns, one of whom had spent a number of years in North Dakota. Of course, the necessary building was financed by the *Caritas-Verband*, as the central Catholic charities organization is termed. Here the Sisters gather, teach and supervise as many little ones as they can crowd in. Many of the children come from communist households, the parents in which are not at all displeased at the idea of nuns. At this institution a little boy or girl can be lodged permanently—that is, supplied with a bed, food and clothing in addition to such day-time attention and instruction as may be required—for a grand total of a dollar a week. When one bears in mind that the cost of living in Germany is never less than half of the cost of living in the United States, it must seem inexplicable how the Sisters not merely do a good job but sustain themselves and hope to pay off the cost of the structure they inhabit to the *Caritas-Verband*. But I could go on and on with such incidents.

Small wonder that an American should have said to me: "The Catholics of our country have a real missionary field right here!" This field is already known to the Salvation Army, which does notably good relief work in Berlin according to the light of its principles, but one will look in vain for a sign of American Catholic interest. It is true that contributions keep on going to the excellent *Bonifatius-Verein*, which has an office in New York, but the need is surely far greater than the amount received. Of course, the Church is today so harassed and loaded down throughout the world that another report on the same old theme has little chance of a

hearing. What ought to be realized, however, is this: the battleground on which such enemies as Bolshevism are being fought is not in Russia. There Communism is already trying to garner the fruits of its victory, and Western civilization can only wait to discern the measure of its success. The fight today is for the needy, impoverished and poisoned masses of Central Europe. We have not learned to understand the missionary idea until we have grasped this truth.

Under such circumstances, Catholic Germany continues to be patient, hard-working and confident of the goodness of God. Its men and women literally bubble over with ideas, enthusiasm and willingness to sacrifice themselves. Again I return to the figure of the present Chancellor. It is not sufficiently well-known that here is a man whose health was seriously impaired by years of military service, who is utterly indifferent to publicity and to popularity in the usual sense of the term, and whose own religious life is manifest in every phase of his public and private action. Coming to the helm in one of the most troubled hours of his country's history, he has held his own with calm, masterly intelligence and almost unparalleled courage. And one can say nothing finer of Dr. Bruening than that he is representative of thousands upon thousands of German Catholics in all walks of life, whose faith is firm and whose hands are never idle. That is a reservoir from which incalculable good can be drawn. What a pity if it should be wasted by reason of the economic and social sins which modern mankind has committed during years of unholy battle and selfishness!

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

By C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., M.A.

XII. In Omnem Veritatem

What I have to say in these short pages can scarcely but be thought crude. I cannot develop it. Yet the point is obvious: We have no right to withhold from our Christians any Christian dogma, nor anything at all that is Christian. We are not Theosophists with an esoteric lore. It is true that Christ Himself went very gradually, and taught even the Apostles, at first, by "parables"; but after a while He was teaching all who would listen to Him the full mystical doctrine of the Faith, and could say boldly to His accusers: "In secret have I spoken nothing."

Now, it cannot be denied that we teach the Catechism thoroughly to our small children while they are at school, and I have been very impressed by the advanced syllabuses which I receive from time to time from the United States; and I get desperate with envy when I hear details of the Catholic philosophy (elementary as it is and should be) which is given to scores of hundreds, I suppose, of young women and men in various Catholic universities and elsewhere in America. But none of this is quite what I mean. Were all this brought to perfection and made universal in the United States, it still would not fulfill what I pray may come everywhere to pass. I have recently read some books, the names of which I need not catalogue, by a priest now living in the United States, concerned with the shortcomings of "Catholicism" in America and at large. But his eyes appeared tight shut to the whole of the supernatural side of the Faith; and in consequence, to use an English vulgarism, he "misses the bus" every time, even were his general strictures justified. I would be ready to grant that they were so, *if* they were so (which they certainly are not), and still I would say: "You are so missing the point of Christianity itself that anything you say about Christians loses its interest for me." As for shortcomings, of course, we have plenty. When did Our Lord expect that we should not fall short? Certainly we love money too much; obviously we pay too much attention to social position; patently we mix up politics, especially

national politics, with that divine work which alone is ours to do. Do not be silly. Anyone can stoop to pick up all sorts of things lying so accessible in the mud among which we have to tread: I have not even too grave an objection to the man who prefers to study puddles provided he sees the stars that are reflected in them. Anyone can see the dough, but not all choose to watch the yeast at its work therein; anyone can study flesh, but not everyone can catch the Spirit struggling with it, nor assess that mysterious imperfection in which God is yet sufficiently pleased to put it into Purgatory.

But I fear that at times we are afraid of some of the things that God has given us to preach, and do not preach them. One such Christian Mystery is, as I fear I have kept saying, the Crucifixion. To be like Christ, we have somehow to die altogether. I have often had people ask me: "But just what *more* do you want me to 'die' to?" They knew, and I knew, that they were living chaste lives; and I could not inquire into their financial methods—and I have even known a priest to say that he himself only saw one sin going about, that against the Sixth Commandment, and that, if you were all right in that department, you were sure to be all right all round. But test that by the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount, where Christ puts forward His ideal. How little, then, has been said about a man when you have said that he is sexually correct! "You have heard," says Our Lord, and He makes a catalogue of things that the Law says you mustn't do, "but *I* say to you. . . ." For example: "Love your enemies; do good to those that hate you." That single mandate demands the driving of at least one nail far deeper than most of us allow it to penetrate. I know how careful one must be not to turn counsels into commands; but what we must aim at, and preach, is the full Christian vision, and that has nothing to do, for example, with exterior success. Numbers, bulk, the pageant of this world, are not measures by which we can judge of anything Christian whatsoever. When in Australia, during the Eucharistic Congress, the secretary fell grievously ill on his way to that continent and could see nothing of what was happening: when the conductor of the whole of its music lost an eye; when a very important official broke his leg; when a prelate died of a stroke and a nun in a railway accident, I began to feel certain that Our Lord must love that Congress very much, since He so "chastened" its participants: when I was myself

involved in a small accident that cost much pain, I felt sure that He was meaning to bless what little work I could do there. The Pageant was laced with *pain*—pain, I knew, accepted at least in the case of those others in the spirit of the life-giving death of Jesus. True, Pain by itself is sterile; but crucifixional pain is resurrectional pain, and without such a Cross there *is* no Resurrection and no life.

The next Mystery, as I have already hinted, is the human life of Our Lord. We can know so much theology about Him, and so little about *Him*. This is not a topic that needs to be as it were sublimated intellectually, as the Catechism does when children begin to ask more questions and deeper ones; true, the outline can be indefinitely filled up by knowledge of the world in which Christ lived, and by a careful "harmonization" of the Gospels. But my experience has been again and again that the sheer *story* comes with a new thrill when it is told with extreme simplicity, yet with realism. What a thrill was my own when only recently I found out that, when Our Lord was proclaiming that *He* was the true light, He was standing in those temple courts which, during that feast, were illuminated by two huge candelabra symbolically supposed to give light to all the city, and indeed all Palestine! I pray earnestly that all priests, especially young ones, may *like* recreations that are *priestly*. There is obviously no harm in cards as such, though harm may come that way; but there is nothing priestly about cards as such. I would like a young priest to *enjoy better than cards*—let alone horse racing or football matches—learning all he possibly could about the human conditions in which Our Lord spent his life. The psychology of the Gospels, to mention nothing else, is entrancing.

The third Mystery which perhaps we are afraid to preach (though, I am bound to confess, all the world over we seem less and less afraid to do so) is everything connected with Grace, and with Grace as taught by Our Lord, by St. John and by St. Paul. One still hears people say: "Those things are above my congregation—why, they are above me! I can't go in for all this mysticism." They cannot be too great for any one of us, since it was to us Our Lord presented them. And though maybe in a sermon I have not expatiated, so to say, upon Supernatural Grace, Incorporation with Our Lord, the Inhabitation of the Holy Ghost, I have *never*—I deliberately say *never*—found that small groups, where you can attend to the psychic

reaction of each, have failed to respond. Neither in retreats to soldiers nor to Scottish medical students (and, if you knew what that implied—I love them, but still . . .) have I hesitated to preach the full “St. Paul” and the full “St. John” in all that concerns this matter. I am quite sure that girls and men nowadays do *not want* an easy religion: they do not want a merely practical, commonsense religion. At the beginning of a retreat in an Irish university that I need not name, I received an anonymous note: “You may as well know we *hate* retreats: they are given either by X-ists, who try to frighten us and we are too old to be frightened, or by Z-ists, who try to prove to us how sensible it is to be religious and how it pays in the long run: we want something nobler than that. So now do your damndest.” I read the note aloud; I acknowledged how interesting it was; I said I had prepared on the whole what I had meant to say, and would alter none of it. *Quod potero, faciam*. I neither left out hell, nor a very full discussion of the sixth commandment: nor yet Grace and all that it implies. Thank God, the men came more numerous each day.

In conclusion, therefore, I pray that a priest will from seminary upwards “learn Jesus Christ,” and unlearn everything else whatsoever. We are not our own. We are not ourselves. We are *one of the ways* in which Jesus Christ communicates Himself to the world. Our first business is to put nothing in His path, no obstacle. Our next and more positive aim must be to be able to say: “I live . . . well, yes, and yet not I. Christ lives in me. By His grace my actions have become His.”

IS THERE A VOLSTEAD COW?

By J. ELLIOT ROSS, PH.D.

One of the stock stories in classes in moral theology is that of the man who asked a priest if it would be all right for him to keep a piece of rope he had picked up on the road. The catch was that there was a cow attached to the rope, and by taking the rope home with him the man also took the cow.

Of course, the point of the story was the need for confessors to inquire into the circumstances of an act that might be confessed. If a man found a piece of rope worth only a few cents, and that was all there was to it, naturally there would be no obligation of restitution. But if there were a cow on one end of the rope, that would be a white horse—or cow—of another color.

A good bit of the discussion of Prohibition from a moral standpoint seems to me to illustrate this story of the rope. Let us suppose, for instance, that we believe the Volstead Law to be unjust or at most purely penal, and that the individual who takes a drink of contraband liquor is not by that fact doing anything immoral or sinful. The same thing would hold for a man who transported pre-Volstead liquor in his own car to the house of a friend, or for a man who made actually intoxicating liquor in his own home, or for a man who smuggled in a bottle of whiskey from Canada. And Dr. John A. Ryan tells us that he was thinking about such violations (*The Commonwealth*, April 3, 1929).

Now when Dr. Ryan says: "I do not think that the national prohibition laws are any longer binding in conscience," he is careful to add: "The question of their indirect obligation, on account of the social disorder which their violation entails, is one that I am not now called upon to discuss" (*The Commonwealth*, June 26, 1929). Dr. Ryan implies that, although he does not enter into this discussion of an indirect obligation, such a discussion is needed. But when Catholics see a statement such as Dr. Ryan's in a popular magazine like *The Commonwealth*, is there not danger of their forgetting his hint about an indirect obligation? May they not conclude that no acts violating the Volstead Law are morally wrong?

And what if there happen to be a cow on the other end of the

Volstead violation? It is, of course, a commonplace among Catholic moralists that an act derives its morality, not only from the object, but also from the circumstances. Picking up a piece of rope is in itself indifferent. But a cow on the other end gives it a different moral complexion. And, as far as my reading goes, most of the discussion about the Volstead Law has left out of consideration the circumstances which may seriously alter the act—even supposing the Volstead Law is unjust or purely penal. Although Dr. Ryan may not have been called upon to discuss in *The Commonwealth* the indirect obligations regarding the Volstead Law, could not THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW call upon him, or some other moralist of note, to discuss these obligations in its pages?

For instance, if a man confesses to me that he has violated the Volstead Law, and my questioning elicits the information that he is a professional rum-runner, that he always goes armed, and that he intends to shoot to kill any officer who interferes with his operations, may I give him absolution if he is determined to continue in this attitude? Should I say: "My son, you have a perfect right to use the opinion of learned and numerous theologians who hold that the Volstead Law is unjust. In fact, so far from doing anything wrong, you may look upon yourself as a hero, in the same class with the Old Continentals in their ragged regimentals, yielding not to the tyranny of an impious government."

Or suppose that a man is bootlegging whiskey without using proper precautions to insure that it should not be poisonous. Somebody is doing this. And may not some of our Catholics be mixed up in the racket? And may they not be salving their consciences by the wellknown opposition to the Volstead Law of so many of our Catholic leaders?

Mark, I am not objecting to this opposition, but only to the fact that it does not take into consideration all the elements in the situation. I am not defending the Volstead Law any more than I am defending the Stamp Act or the Tea Tax of colonial days—or the tariff on diamonds. The tariff on diamonds may be purely penal, or it may even be unjust. But if there are any reputable moralists who would say that armed defense of smuggling in diamonds, a defense that had cost the lives of hundreds of smugglers and enforcement officers, would be perfectly all right, I should like to have

them come out in the open and say so. Until they do say this, I shall keep on wondering if this circumstance in connection with liquor violations does not constitute a cow on the other end of our Volstead rope.

For moralists quite generally maintain that the violator of a purely penal law is bound to accept the punishment if he gets caught. They do not justify his shooting his way out of getting caught. And I believe that, if every time the purely penal character of the Volstead Law were emphasized, this obligation to accept the punishment would be mentioned, it would be better for our own reputation and for the best interests of our country.

It will occur to someone, of course, to distinguish between a law that is purely penal but just and a law that is purely penal and unjust. And the distinction is legitimate. But does the fact of a law being unjust make morally lawful the use of such violence as we have had in resisting the enforcement of the Volstead Law? Our moralists have considered very adequately the question of armed rebellion against a tyrannical government. Some go so far as to say that such armed rebellion is never justified, that citizens must be content with passive resistance. And I do not know of any moralists who would justify armed resistance under such circumstances as attend the Volstead Law. But if such resistance is justified, let us say so frankly. We should not take refuge in saying that the Volstead Law in the abstract is unjust.

Or can armed resistance to an enforcement officer be reduced to a case of resisting unjust aggression? If the Volstead Law is unjust, does a rum-runner who defends his property against an enforcement officer fulfill all the conditions our moralists lay down to justify defense against unjust aggression? At any rate, I have not seen the sort of calm, impartial consideration of this question that we have had of other cases. And I am merely making a plea that we have this consideration.

The rum-runner does not, of course, exhaust the cases we have under the Volstead Law. Suppose a bootlegger is a peace-loving individual, devoted to his family, contributing generously to the Church. He does not go armed—because he has bought immunity from those who have taken an oath to enforce the law; or he belongs

to a ring that has bought immunity. In another article in *The Commonwealth* (April 16, 1930), Mr. Sutherland Bates tells us that "the yearly graft of border control officials amounts to \$2,000,000 in the vicinity of Detroit," and he implies that in Philadelphia the graft is \$10,000,000.

What then? Is a good Catholic justified in bribing officials not to enforce a law, even if that law be purely penal, or in the judgment of some men unjust? The Volstead Law may not bind in conscience, but an oath does. Any particular individual is not compelled to take an oath to enforce the Volstead Law. He can earn a living in some other way. But if he has taken an oath to enforce the Volstead Law, may he enforce it against some, and take a bribe not to enforce it against others? Does bribing an officer to violate his oath mean becoming accessory to his sin, and does it constitute a cow on the end of our Volstead rope?

It has sometimes been said in connection with the Volstead Law that one way of repealing a law is by not enforcing it, or by wholesale disregard of it. And our attention has been called to innumerable laws that have gone into innocuous desuetude in this way. In some States, for instance, it is against the law to sell a cigar or a newspaper on Sunday. But this case is not a parallel to the Volstead Law. For the police never collect any graft for allowing some individuals to sell cigars on Sunday, while enforcing the law against other dealers. If public opinion were the same towards the Volstead Law that it is towards the so-called "blue laws," there would be no graft, and we should have merely a rope. These "blue laws" have fallen into innocuous desuetude. But the desuetude of the Volstead Law is very far from innocuous when it is the occasion of millions of dollars of graft every year.

If the opponents of Prohibition would do what Gandhi is doing in India about the salt laws there, I should feel considerably more respect for them. Gandhi openly violates the law by making salt publicly. What salt he makes is not edible, I understand, but he does not care. He is interested in the principle, and he is willing to go to jail if arrested. Gandhi does not buy salt from a bootlegger who has bribed a British official. How much moral influence would Gandhi have if he merely boasted that he could buy salt at fifty thousand speakeasies?

Will some prominent wet organize a group of a hundred followers, advertise the fact that he is going to make whiskey, set up a still in a public park, and start the process? That is what Gandhi has done in regard to salt. He may succeed in forcing the repeal of the odious law, or he may not. But in the meantime he is immeasurably bigger morally than the furtive patron of a speakeasy surreptitiously gratifying his thirst.

I confess that I cannot understand the mental processes of those who deplore the graft and corruption and crime coming out of contraband liquor, and yet who patronize bootleggers. Of course, the fact that the Volstead Law occasions enormous graft may be a good argument for repealing the law. But is it an argument for allowing the graft? And it is the graft that I am concerned with. If there are any moralists who justify the bribing of officials not to enforce the Volstead Law, I wish they would tell us so plainly. And if they do not justify it, I wish they would say so just as plainly.

It would be easier, I suppose, to justify offering bribes on the part of bootleggers than it would be to justify the taking of bribes by the officials. So let us come to the case of the Catholic officials. Are any of them taking bribes because they have heard it said in Catholic pulpits, or have read in Catholic magazines, that the Volstead Law is unjust, that no one is bound to obey the Volstead Law?

Put the matter concretely. In New York City we have a Catholic mayor, a Catholic chief of police, a large percentage of Catholic policemen and magistrates. Are any of them getting graft from the violators of the Volstead Law? I may be wrong, but I wonder if some of the speakeasies—thirty thousand or more, according to Grover Whalen—could exist if they were not bribing their way. And what are we doing to tell the Catholic policemen and other officials that they are sinning if they take graft in this connection? There is in New York City a Catholic Holy Name Society for policemen. At their Communion breakfasts did anyone ever tell them that, although the Volstead Law may not bind in conscience, they are not allowed to sell immunity to any violators, that there are circumstances making its violation sinful, that there may be a cow on the end of the rope?

I began with the cases that seem to be clearest of flies in the ointment, or cows on the rope. But I have my doubts even about

the purchaser of bootleg liquor. Technically, according to the decision of some federal judges, he is not violating the Volstead Law. I suppose we have a probable opinion that the Volstead Law does not bind in conscience. And as a confessor, on the theory of probabilism, I must give a penitent the benefit of that opinion. But if I question a man who confesses buying bootleg liquor, and he admits that the bootlegger has a record of having killed several enforcement officers, does that mean that the purchaser is coöperating in this sinful act of the bootlegger? Or suppose that the act of shooting is several steps back, until we come to a rum-runner? Or eliminate shooting, and merely suppose bribery. To me it is perfectly clear that, if there were no purchasers for contraband liquor, there would be no shooting and no bribery of enforcement officers. Do the purchasers of the contraband liquor, then, coöperate in the shooting and the bribery?

When I turn to the tract in my moral theology on coöperation, I find described several ways of coöperating that seem to have a place here. One way of coöperating is by counsel. But money talks, and the large profits offered to bootleggers are the most effective counsel possible to engage in the business; and the business means graft and violence at one point or another.

Another way of coöperating is by receiving the result of the evil action. If the goods are stolen, the case is perfectly clear. But what if they are simply smuggled? Does a man who buys diamonds he knows were smuggled, and smuggled at the cost of hundreds of lives and millions of dollars of graft in corrupting revenue officers—does he participate in the smuggling, and in the crimes connected with the smuggling? I am inclined to think that he does.

Still a third way of coöperating is by furnishing the means. And the man who buys contraband liquor is furnishing the means of carrying on the trade. For the capital needed for the business is a revolving fund. The original amount must be replaced by what is received from purchasers, or the business goes to smash. Consequently, not only those who put up the original capital, but also those who afterwards buy the goods, are furnishing means to commit the wrongful actions.

A man who purchases tickets for an obscene show coöperates in the obscenity. It may be that he is personally immune to such oc-

casions of sin. Nevertheless, if the show is of such a nature that generally it results in evil thoughts and desires for the spectators, no moralist that I know of would justify furnishing the money to stimulate its production by buying tickets. Nor will moralists excuse the purchaser of tickets on the ground that his few dollars would not go far towards paying the expenses of production (cfr. Liguori, lib. IV, tr. IV, n. 427). Although the purchaser may know that the show will continue without his patronage, still he coöperates in the show (cfr. De Lugo, *De Justitia et Jure*, XVII, II, n. 37). Ballerini uses an illustration that seems to apply to purchasers of bootleg liquor. If ten men suffice to launch a boat, he says, and an eleventh man helps, certainly he is truly said to be helpful (*Theologia Moralis*, II, pp. 696-7). And so, if nine hundred and ninety-nine purchasers suffice to finance a liquor ring, the thousandth purchaser would still coöperate.

Moreover, Noldin says that it is never lawful to coöperate in a sin which *tends* to the injury of Church or State. Bribery and shooting enforcement officers seem to me to be sins tending to the harm of the State. And buying contraband liquor seems to be coöperating in the shooting and the bribery.

Prohibition is not only one of the livest political questions we have before us today in this country, it is also one of the livest moral issues. And I have been disappointed at the rather superficial treatment it has received. I have read most of what has appeared on it in our Catholic magazines, and, as far as I can see, we seem to have been concerned principally with ropes, and have neglected possible cows. Can not THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW do us a service by eliciting as thorough a discussion of this matter as we have of some other moral questions? Such a discussion has a lot of potential dynamite in it. But that only indicates its real importance. We can discuss dead issues in perfect safety. But why wait till this issue is dead before we really discuss it?

To make the matter concrete and definite, then, let me propose the following cases:

(1) Cassius is engaged in driving a liquor-laden truck from Canada. He goes armed, and he intends to shoot to kill, whether the man who interferes with him is a hijacker or an enforcement

officer. Can Cassius be given absolution if he intends to continue in this work?

(2) Judas is the man higher up in the case of Cassius. He would not risk his own life driving a truck, but he furnishes the capital to buy the liquor in Canada, and he has several men like Cassius working for him. At least some of these men have actually killed enforcement officers, and Judas knows it. But Judas does not like violence if he can avoid it, and so he bribes what officials he can.

(3) John is a retail bootlegger. He does not kill and does not bribe. But he gets his liquor from Judas, and he knows the violence and corruption farther back in the system. Can John be absolved if he intends to continue his connection with Judas?

(4) Edward does not kill, but he runs a speakeasy. In order to obtain immunity, he pays the police captain of his district \$1,000 a month. Can Edward be absolved if he intends to continue in business, and to bribe when necessary?

(5) Jonathan is a policeman. As his share of the graft in granting immunity to certain speakeasies, he receives \$100 a month. Can Jonathan be absolved if he intends to continue taking bribes?

(6) Eleanor is a society woman who spends large sums on contraband liquor. She buys from John; John buys from Judas; Judas employs men like Cassius who are willing to kill, and who (he knows) have actually killed enforcement officers; also Judas bribes officials to allow John to ply his trade. Eleanor knows all this at least confusedly. May Eleanor be absolved if she intends to continue buying from John?

As I see the Prohibition situation, there are fanatical drys and fanatical wets. There is no chance of either changing. But in between are a number of men who are not blinded by prejudice. The ultimate solution—whether that be an observance of the law, or a modification of it, or actual repeal of the 18th Amendment—will depend on these men in between. But they will not be won by fanaticism. If they are to follow wet or damp leadership, that leadership must have clean hands. The wets who boast of graft, violence, general lawlessness, defiant drinking, leave them where they were.

To me the answer to some of the foregoing questions depends upon the fact that we have the political machinery for changing the

Volstead Law, and even the Eighteenth Amendment. Under the Eighteenth Amendment, as Dr. Ryan has pointed out, we could have at least 2.75 per cent beer. I am not wedded to one-half of one per cent. But what makes me wonder about how far public sentiment is really against the Volstead Law is the fact that no such change has been made. An aggressive minority could possibly have put over the Eighteenth Amendment in the first place. But I do not see how it could have kept the Volstead Law in the face of the same pressure politics from the antis that Prohibitionists had used, and with the public sentiment as strongly against the Volstead Law as the antis claim.

And although Dr. McBain, of Columbia, in his work "Prohibition Legal and Illegal," is strongly of the opinion that we cannot have whiskey under the Eighteenth Amendment, I am inclined to think that a strong majority could devise a way out. As intoxicating liquor for medicinal purposes is not prohibited, why could not alcohol be looked upon as a drug, and the regulations for physicians' prescriptions loosened up to such an extent that we should have some sort of dispensary system?

When we have the political machinery for peaceably changing law, I am going to be slow in admitting, in the first place, that a law is unjust, and secondly that violence and corruption may be rightfully used in violating the law. Down in Texas I voted for State prohibition. I am convinced that national prohibition came too soon. There was not a sufficient public opinion back of it. But as long as we have the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Law, I think that we make a mistake in issuing isolated statements to the effect that the Volstead Law does not bind in conscience. In actual life, no acts are ever isolated. They are always clothed with circumstances. And we should consider the circumstances connected with violating the Volstead Law. We should see if there is a Volstead Cow.

PROCEDURAL LAW OF THE CODE

By STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Formal Opening of the Trial

The object or matter of the trial is fixed by the *contestatio litis* (the joining of issues), which consists in the formal denial by the defendant of the claim of the plaintiff made with the intention of litigating the case before the judge (Canon 1726).

The summons to the defendant gives him official notice that someone asserts a claim against him in a given matter and for certain reasons, which must at least in general terms be indicated in the summons in order that the defendant may know whether or not he may legitimately contest the claim of the plaintiff. On the appointed day both plaintiff and defendant, or their representatives, appear in court in answer to the summons. The defendant has been given time between the receipt of the summons and the day set for appearance in court to reflect whether he should or should not contest the claim of the plaintiff. He is not obliged to enter into a lawsuit; in fact, the Church prefers that the parties settle disputes by mutual good will and agreement. Of course, as soon as the matter has been brought to court, the court has the right to supervise and make binding the agreement between the plaintiff and defendant. If the defendant believes that he has good reasons to contest the claim of the plaintiff, he may at this first appearance in court declare his mind to resist the demands of the plaintiff, and he does so by a formal denial of the specific claim of the plaintiff.

FORM OF THE "CONTESTATIO LITIS"

No formalities are required for the joining of issues; it suffices that the parties appear before the judge or his delegate, and that the complaint or petition of the plaintiff and the denial of the defendant, whereby the matter in dispute and the points of the controversy are clearly determined, are inserted into the acts of the case (Canon 1727).

The formalities of the joining of issues are narrowed down to the bare essentials of the assertion of the claim of the plaintiff and the

denial of the defendant. It is important for the plaintiff, however, to be exact in the recital of the facts on which he bases his claim and in specifying exactly what he demands of the defendant. The denial of the defendant must be exactly to the point, denying the particular claim of the plaintiff and the facts on which he bases his claim. The petition or complaint of the plaintiff and the denial of the defendant made before the judge are to be written into the acts of the case by the clerk of the court.

In more complicated cases, however, when the complaint of the plaintiff is neither clear nor simple or when the answer of the defendant abounds with difficulties, the judge should either *ex officio* or at the instance of either party summon the parties to court for the purpose of specifying the paragraphs or counts (*dubia*), so that the issues over which the two parties litigate may be determined (Canon 1728).

The entire trial is based on the petition or complaint of the plaintiff and the answer of the defendant, and the court cannot admit further claims in the course of the trial or anything extraneous to the original petition of the plaintiff. The court demands of the plaintiff that he prove the facts and other points alleged in his original petition fixed in the joining of issues, and nothing outside of the points raised in the opening of the trial will be admitted.

What is called in Canon 1728 *dubia concordanda*, corresponds to the common-law joining of issues. "The issues are ascertained by requiring the alternate pleadings of plaintiff and defendant to be so constructed as to finally present some point distinctly affirmed on one side and distinctly denied on the other. When the point of controversy has in this way been ascertained, the pleadings are ended, and the parties are, in legal parlance, said to be at issue" (Philips, "Principles of Pleading," n.48). Evidently the court wants to know whether the plaintiff has a *prima facie* legal claim against the defendant, and it further must know precisely the points of contention between the litigating parties. The statements of the plaintiff must be direct assertions, and hypothetical, conditional, equivocal phrases must be avoided. Likewise, the answer of the defendant to the claims of the plaintiff must be direct denials. If, for instance, one parish demands of another ecclesiastical corporation payment of a certain amount of money shown on the face of a matured note held

by the parish against the other corporation, the defense of fraud that the defendant corporation may have should be stated positively, saying that the note (describing the same) held by the plaintiff was fraudulently executed in the name of the defendant and that it is not the defendant's note. The answer should not be, "if the plaintiff is the owner of a note against the defendant, etc.," for the answer of the defendant must be a direct and positive denial.

The importance of the exact definition of the points of controversy between the litigants is emphasized in Canon 1728, which directs the court to appoint a special day for the determination of the points at issue in those cases in which the petition of the plaintiff or the answer of the defendant is complicated and difficult. In that session in court the Code directs the following to be done:

If on the day appointed by the court for the joining of issues, a party, though properly summoned, does not appear, nor give a just excuse for absenting himself, he shall be declared guilty of contempt of court, and the formulation of the counts or points claimed by the plaintiff or raised in denial by the defendant shall be fixed by the judge *ex officio* at the request of the party who appeared. The party guilty of contempt of court shall immediately be notified by the court of the fixing of the counts in order that he may within the time allowed at the discretion of the judge make exceptions and objections to the counts and justify his absence.

If the parties appear and agree on the points or counts about which they intend to litigate, and the judge on his part finds no objection to the issues, he shall so state in the decree by which the form of the issues is fixed.

If, however, the parties disagree (*e.g.*, the defendant may claim that the plaintiff has no legal basis for some of the counts, and therefore demur to their insertion in the case), or if the judge does not approve of the conclusions reached by the parties over controverted points, the judge himself shall by decree settle the disputed point.

Once the forms of the points at issue have been fixed, they cannot be changed except by a new decree of the judge, which cannot be given except for a grave reason and at the request of one of the parties or of the diocesan prosecutor or *defensor vinculi*. If the prosecutor or the *defensor vinculi* requests the alteration, both parties must be heard and their reason for objecting be given consideration;

if one of the parties requests the alteration, the opposing party must be heard and his reasons for objecting be considered by the court (Canon 1729).

TAKING OF EVIDENCE NOT TO START BEFORE JOINING OF ISSUES

Before the joining of issues has taken place, the judge shall not proceed with the examination of witnesses and the admission of other proofs except in the case of contempt of court, or when it becomes necessary to take the depositions of witnesses lest they die or move away, or when for any other reason it would be difficult to obtain their testimony later on (Canon 1730).

EFFECT OF THE JOINING OF ISSUES

The joining of issues has the following consequences:

(1) the plaintiff may not change the bill of complaint unless the defendant consents and the judge for good reasons believes that the change should be admitted, but the defendant always has the right to obtain compensation for damages and expenses, if any are due to him. The bill of complaint is not considered altered, if the manner of proof is shortened or altered; if the principal claim or the secondary claims are reduced; if the circumstances of a fact stated in the bill of complaint are illustrated, completed, or amended in such a way that the object of the controversy remains the same; if, instead of the object itself, the price, or interest, or something equivalent is asked;

(2) the judge shall fix an appropriate interval of time within which the parties must procure and complete the proofs of their case. This interval may be prolonged at the discretion of the judge if the parties request a postponement, but he must see that the trial is not unduly protracted;

(3) the possessor of the property or rights of another ceases to possess in good faith. Consequently, if the case is decided against him, he must restore not only the thing itself, but also the fruits which the thing has produced since the joining of issues, and he is, moreover, obliged to repair any damages caused since that moment (Canon 1731).

In reference to the last paragraph about prescription, canonists

distinguish between a civil and a natural interruption of prescription. Naturally the man who possessed goods or rights in good faith until the litigation began concerning those goods or rights does not cease to possess in good faith; on the contrary, the reasons advanced by the plaintiff in his petition to the court and in the contestation of the lawsuit may seem so futile to the possessor that he is all the more convinced of the justice of his possession. However, civilly the possession in good faith required for legal prescription is interrupted until the final sentence in the trial. The lawsuit may last two years and during that time the possessor is answerable to the court for the goods held by him and for the revenue or profit derived from them, and the court can hold him responsible for losses or damages to the goods. If the possessor takes as much care of those goods as any prudent man would take of his own goods, and if nevertheless loss or damage happens to befall the goods, the question arises whether the possessor is answerable to the court also for such accidental loss or damage. There is no explicit ruling in the Code on this point but only the precept that, if the possessor loses the lawsuit and is ordered to give possession to his adversary, he is held liable for benefits accrued and damages caused pending the litigation. If the Code said that the possessor from the opening of the lawsuit becomes a possessor in bad faith or equivalent to such, he would be liable for damages to the goods even though they happened without his fault; if, however, he continues in possession after the manner of a *sequester* (i.e., a man appointed by the court to hold possession of disputed goods until the court has ruled on the right of possession), he would not be liable for purely accidental damages to the goods. Equity demands that the possessor in the case be held equivalent to a *sequester* rather than to a possessor in bad faith.

The *iuramentum calumniæ* which is mentioned frequently in the old Canon Law is not mentioned in the Code except in the trial or process of Beatification and Canonization (cfr. Canon 2037, §4). In the former law, after the *contestatio litis* the parties had to take the *iuramentum calumniæ* (in civil, not in criminal cases), by which they swore that they believed they had a good case to go to law, and that they intended to avoid all falsehood, deceit and fraud in pleading their side of the case. The custom of not demanding the *iuramen-*

tum calumniæ had become general in the ecclesiastical courts before the Code of Canon Law was promulgated.

THE INSTANCE OF A SUIT

The instance begins with the joining of the issues; it ends in any of the ways in which a trial may be ended; but it can also be interrupted before, and may be even terminated by abatement (which is defined in Canon 1736) or by renunciation (Canon 1732).

The procedural law of the Code speaks frequently of cases being in the first, second and further instance. Wherefore, it is of importance to know what is meant by the term "instance." The instance means all judicial acts performed for the purpose of litigating a case from the joining of issues to the final sentence. The trial may not go through all the acts after it has been started by the joining of issues, for the parties may agree to end it before the final sentence by friendly agreement, by arbitration, etc. Besides, the instance may be interrupted, and it may be terminated by abatement and by renunciation. In the following Canons the Code lays down the rules for interruption of the instance and for termination of it by abatement and by renunciation.

INTERRUPTION OF THE INSTANCE

If a litigating party dies, or changes his state (a change of state that deprives him of the ability or the right to act in court), or if a party loses the office by reason of which he acted in the case, the following rules obtain:

(1) if the case has not yet been closed, the instance is interrupted until the heir of the deceased or the successor (in office) resumes the litigation;

(2) if the case has been closed (*causa conclusa*), the instance is not interrupted, and the judge must continue the procedure, summoning the proxy (if there be one) or otherwise the heir of the deceased or the successor in office (Canon 1733).

Canon 1860 explains what is meant by the *conclusio in causa*: the closing of the case, in so far as the parties are concerned, takes place when the parties have declared at the inquiry of the judge that they have no more to say in proof or defense of their case, and the judge

has issued a written statement that the case is closed. The judge has the right to fix a date for the final presentation in court of evidence by the parties, for the law prescribes that the judge should endeavor to finish lawsuits speedily.

SUITS CONCERNING RIGHT TO BENEFICE AND DEATH OF ONE OF THE PARTIES

If there is a controversy between two clerics about the right to a benefice, and one of them dies while the case is pending, or one resigns the benefice, the instance is not interrupted, but the prosecutor (*promotor iustitiæ*) conducts the case against the survivor in behalf of the liberty of the benefice or of the church. The prosecutor does not enter into the case, if the benefice is one of those which the bishop can freely confer (*i.e.*, without interference of a patron or other person having a right to designate, elect, etc., the incumbent), and if the bishop prefers to give it to the surviving party, as though he had won the case (Canon 1734).

INTERRUPTION OF INSTANCE BY ELIMINATION OF PROXY OR GUARDIAN

If a proxy or a guardian gives up his office, the instance remains interrupted until the party or the persons concerned have appointed a new proxy or guardian, or have declared that they henceforth will continue personally the trial of the case (Canon 1735).

Everyone who has a right to act as plaintiff or defendant in court may, if he so desires, appoint a proxy or representative to act for him in court. If the proxy gives up his office, the lawsuit is interrupted until the party either appoints a new representative or declares to the court that he himself will act in court. Minors and other persons who can act in court only through a guardian are protected in law to the extent that, if the guardian ceases to act for them, the Ordinary may appoint a guardian for them to represent them in court and protect their interests.

ABATEMENT OF THE INSTANCE BY LAPSE OF TIME

If, without the intervention of any impediment, no procedural act has been done in the court of the first instance for two years or in

the court of appeal for one year, the instance abates; if in the court of appeal no action has been taken for one year, the sentence which is contested in the appeal becomes a *res iudicata*, that is, an adjudged case from which there is no appeal (Canon 1736).

The parties to a lawsuit are not permitted to extend the trial indefinitely. The plaintiff and the defendant are obliged to prosecute their rights with all diligence, and, if one of them is indifferent and unduly delays the procedure, the other party can request the judge to force the other to act either in person or through his representative. If that party ignores the orders of the judge, the court can declare him guilty of contempt and after due warning proceed with the case and settle it. If both parties are indifferent and stop all activity for two years (in the court of the first instance), the case is thrown out of court. If both parties are neglectful in prosecuting the case in appeal and take no action for a year, the sentence of the first court becomes final and unappealable.

EFFECT OF ABATEMENT OF THE INSTANCE

The abatement or discarding of a lawsuit is effective *ipso iure* (i.e., without the need of a declaration on the part of the court wherein the suit abated), and holds good against all litigants, even minors and other persons having the privilege of minors; and if the same matter is again brought to court (by the same litigants), the exception of *res iudicata* must be raised against it *ex officio*, because the law admits no further litigation about the same matter between the same persons. If a proxy or a guardian or an administrator has been the cause of the abatement of the instance, the parties wronged by their representatives can sue them for damages, and they will be held liable unless they can prove that they were not at fault (Canon 1737).

EFFECT OF ABATEMENT OF THE INSTANCE IN REFERENCE TO THE ACTS OF THE CASE

The abatement of the instance wipes out the acts of the process, but it does not destroy the acts of the cause itself. The latter can have their force in another instance or lawsuit, provided the new trial is between the same persons and over the same matter. As to out-

siders, the acts of the case have no other force or effect than of documents (Canon 1738).

The procedural law distinguishes between the *acta processus* and *acta causæ*. The *acta processus* denote all acts in court which have to do with the legal formalities of the procedure; the *acta causæ* embrace all acts which have to do with the merits of the case on the part of the plaintiff and the defendant, testimony of witnesses, documents, admissions and denials by the parties, etc. The acts concerning the merits of the case retain their force and are conclusive concerning the parties to the litigation if the same case is again brought to court. As to other persons, the acts concerning the merits of the case have merely the force of documents.

EXPENDITURES OF LITIGATION IN CASE OF ABATEMENT

In the case of the abatement of an instance, each litigant shall bear the expenses which he incurred in connection with the abated case (Canon 1739).

RENUNCIATION OF THE INSTANCE AND OF ACTS OF THE PROCESS

The plaintiff may renounce the instance at any stage and in any degree of the trial; likewise, both the plaintiff and the defendant may renounce either all or only some of the acts of procedure.

For the validity of the renunciation it is necessary that it be made in writing, that it be signed by the party or by his proxy empowered thereto by special mandate, that it be made known to the other party and be accepted by him, or at least not objected to by him, and that it be admitted by the judge (Canon 1740).

EFFECTS OF RENUNCIATION

Once the renunciation has been admitted by the judge, it has, in so far as the acts which one has renounced are concerned, the same effect as the abatement of the instance. The renouncing party is obliged to pay the costs of the acts which he renounces (Canon 1741).

If the plaintiff renounces the instance with the consent or acquiescence of the defendant and the approval of the judge, the question arises whether the plaintiff may later on sue the same defendant in

the same matter. Under the former Canon Law the renunciation of the present lawsuit did not estop the plaintiff from bringing that same suit against the same person later on. The Code states that the renunciation of acts has the same force as abatement (*i.e.*, they are completely wiped out and can never be brought up in court in any manner). The Code does not seem to say the same about the renunciation of the instance or lawsuit itself, and in points in which the new law is not clear the former law on that point is to be considered unchanged. If the defendant desires to be absolutely certain that the plaintiff cannot trouble him again in court about the matter of the present suit, he may refuse to consent to the renunciation of the instance by the plaintiff unless he agrees to renounce explicitly the litigation itself (*i.e.*, the right to sue him at any future time in the same matter). That such a renunciation can be made seems certain from the *Lex Propria* of the Sacred Roman Rota (Apostolic Constitution of Pope Pius X, June 28, 1908), where it is stated that the plaintiff can renounce either the instance, or the litigation itself, or the acts of the process.

IN MEMORIA LACRYMÆ

By A. J. CARMOODY

Shortly after ordination I was sent as assistant to St. A——'s parish. As it was situated in a small town and the congregation was not large, there was scarcely need for two priests there. The pastor, however, was growing very feeble and so the work of the parish fell principally on the assistant, leaving the old priest to spend his few remaining days in some peace and comfort.

Since the pastor proved to be a man of the utmost charm and consideration, it was not long before there developed between us a close relationship, even as of father and son. The old priest had come to the diocese over a half-century previously and had seen its growth from a few scattered mission churches to many populous parishes and splendid religious edifices. But for him all modern events and progress contained no great interest, for in his advanced years his thoughts incessantly turned backward to the missionary work of his younger days. Any slight happening was enough to set him off on his favorite subject. Far from being boresome to me, these tales and discussions were of the utmost interest. Since after years they are still impressed in my memory, they are set down here as nearly as possible as they were related, though I must humbly confess that they lose much in the retelling.

Shortly after my arrival in my new home I purchased my first automobile. As I drove the shining, new machine up to the rectory there was perhaps more than the proper amount of pride in my bearing. Be that as it may, I grandly invited the pastor to go for a ride. He consented, I believe, not from any pleasure in the trip but merely to gratify my vanity. At any rate, we drove around the little community for an hour and then back to the rectory. As the evening was yet young and the summer air was warm, we settled ourselves in comfortable chairs on the secluded front porch. The pastor produced his blackened pipe, which wafted a strange incense to the high heavens, got it drawing well and pointing to my new car still standing at the curb asked:

"I judge that you are very proud of your new machine?"

I admitted that its possession gave me a modicum of pleasure.

"It will be a great help in the work of an extensive parish," he returned. "You know in the old days our parishes were so small that we did not need a machine like that to cover them."

I passed over the gentle irony contained in the remark and asked: "How large was your first parish, Father?"

"Well, it contained the whole southern part of this State in general, for there were no certain boundaries in those days. When I was needed, I attended the northern part of our neighboring State, though that was outside of the diocese entirely. Mission trips of two and three hundred miles to say Mass at various stations and give the few Catholic miners and settlers an opportunity to receive the Sacraments were not uncommon."

"How did you ever travel over so much territory?"

At the question the old missionary's eyes assumed a faraway expression, and I felt that in spirit he was travelling again the rugged mountains and smiling valleys of his first charge.

"Did I not tell you of my horse, 'Amicus'?" he asked rousing at last.

Here I wisely remained silent. If I knew anything of the pastor's characteristics, all signs pointed to an evening's entertainment with a story of the old missions. Without waiting, then, for my reply the missionary began his tale.

"When I was ordained, assistants were unknown at least in this section of the country. The young priest was apportioned a considerable expanse of this western land, given the bishop's blessing, and told to be about his labor of saving souls. My inheritance fell, as I have said, upon the great mountain stretches to the south. In one of the enclosed valleys of the region a more or less permanent settlement had been established, and here the parish church had been erected. After a three days' journey by boat and stage I reached my charge and arranged my few belongings in the living room behind the church. It did not take me long to become acquainted with the few Catholics in that place, but the question soon arose how to care for those scattered throughout the hundreds of square miles of my parish. Though stages ran between the principal camps and settlements, these would solve only a part of the difficulty.

"The solution of my dilemma came sooner than I expected. A party of horsemen were going through the mining camps racing their mounts against any local products and giving the miners an opportunity to bet their gold on the results of the contests. One of the riders in a rage at the loss of a race had mercilessly abused and beaten his horse so that the animal appeared to be ruined. Since the owner offered to sell the poor beast at a ridiculously small sum, I paid over the amount and led my purchase away.

"The crowd of spectators and loungers, who had gathered to see the races, laughed at my bargain and engaged in some goodnatured repartee at my expense. And truly a more pitiable-looking equine could scarcely be imagined. With low-hung head he limped along and showed every mark of a broken spirit. A little rest and kind treatment, however, worked wonders with the animal; and in a short time I had a mount equal to any in the whole region of the mines. His coat took on a rich roan color; his naturally high spirits returned; with head held high and sparkling eye he would respond to my call no matter how far away he might be. I named him 'Amicus,' for he was a friend indeed.

"No more faithful horse ever carried a rider. Though we were gone for days and sometimes for weeks on the missions, he never tired. He even appeared to get the greatest enjoyments from the trips. I often wondered if in his beast soul he did not dimly realize that he was having a part in a sacred work and rejoiced accordingly. At least, whether knowing it or not, he helped to do God's work in that primitive and wild country.

"It is hard to realize in this age of machinery the feeling which the pioneers of former days held for their mounts. Often their very lives depended upon the horses they rode; no wonder, then, that they held their dumb friends in such high esteem, no wonder that they considered the comfort of the beast before that of the man. Such was my esteem and my care for Amicus; nor would this surprise you, if you could have gone along with us into the wilderness. On the trail between settlements we might ride for a whole day and meet no human being. Evening perhaps would overtake us on the way, making an open camp necessary. A pleasant mountain vale would be chosen for the purpose, where there was a good stream of water and plenty of grass for pasture. I would remove pack, saddle and

bridle from Amicus, and give him an encouraging slap to be on his way to a well-earned rest and pasturage. After starting the camp fire and preparing a simple meal, I would make my bed for the night, for the mountain darkness falls quickly. Perhaps by the flickering light of the camp fire I would finish my Office for the day; then into the blankets I'd roll to sleep as snugly as any king in his bed of gold. As the fire burnt low and the stars came out one by one through the branches of the towering trees, the awful silence of the forest would close over me like a pall. I need not tell you that at such a time it was a comfort to know that a friend was close, even though that friend was a dumb animal; it was reassuring to hear the stamp of a hoof or an occasional snort at some danger, real or imaginary, in the forest.

"In the morning I would be awakened by the same faithful companion, reminding me that it was time to be up and on our journey. Stiff with the chill mountain air I would start the dead fire, make a hasty cup of coffee, roll my pack and away again towards the distant settlements. Do you wonder that a common bond develops between a man and a horse of that kind? Are not modern people missing something noble when they travel only by a machine whose heart is iron?

"The trails of that far-flung country were as familiar to Amicus as to myself. He seemed to know instinctively where I wanted to go, so that many a time on a long journey I gave him his head, settled myself comfortably in the saddle, and drowsed or even read a book, knowing that I would be taken without fail to my proper destination. One time only was he at fault, and of that I will tell you now.

"If my memory does not fail, it was the Feast of St. Ann. I had arranged to say Mass the next morning at a mining camp some distance away, but had been delayed in my departure so that late afternoon found me still some miles from my goal. Knowing that there would be but little leisure for me after my arrival, I thought to finish my Office on the way. The trail had been traversed many times before, so giving free rein to Amicus I opened the Breviary. I had finished Vespers and was well started on Compline, when I was interrupted by the sudden stopping of my mount. Upon glancing up I saw that we were off the trail entirely and in a little clearing,

where stood a dilapidated cabin. You may imagine my feeling of surprise, as never before had a mistake of that kind been made by Amicus. I started to turn him by the rein in the proper direction, but he stubbornly refused to move. I struck him with the slack of the rein; he trembled at the unaccustomed blow but still remained rooted to the spot. A sort of unnatural, certainly uncalled-for rage possessed me; I reached down and grasped a strong piece of fallen limb which lay near at hand. With that club I struck blindly before me. Amicus in the meanwhile had turned his head to look backward with beseeching eyes, and the blow fell fairly on his forehead. He sank slowly to his knees beneath me.

"At the same instant a cry for help came from the cabin. Without further ado I turned to investigate and found within lying on a tumble-down bed a very specter of a man. As I bent over his emaciated form, I saw that life was held merely by a thread within him. In gasps his story was told. He had been chopping down a tree, a limb of which in falling had struck him to the ground. Enough strength remained to him to free himself from the weight and drag his crushed body to the cabin. There he had lain for unnumbered days. He was a Catholic, though he had not practised his faith for years. In his dire extremity he had turned again to God and prayed that his present suffering might work good for his soul. Especially had he invoked the good St. Ann, as had been taught to him in his youth by a pious mother.

"With haste I heard his confession and administered the last rites of the Church. It would seem as if his soul had been waiting for that dismissal, for with my words he breathed his last. As well as I might, I composed the poor body in a respectful attitude and turned from the cabin to seek aid at the mines.

"Outside the door I recoiled from the sight which met my eyes. Amicus still remained in his half kneeling posture. One glance was sufficient to show that from that noble frame too life had departed. My impious hand had struck the fatal cerebrum."

While the missionary had related his tale, night had gathered around us also. For a time we sat in silence, for I sensed that the pastor in imagination was making once more camp in the deep mountains. For him the fire blazed merrily; the night wind sighed through the tall pines; there was a symphony of peaceful music in

the running snow waters. The old priest came to with a sigh, felt for his cane and hobbled slowly into the rectory. I cannot be sure, but I thought I saw a tear run down his furrowed visage; and I felt that it was only just that after fifty years a tear should be shed for that magnificent friend, Amicus.

I too arose and stood at the top of the steps looking into the street. The moon had come up and was bathing my new automobile in its soft beams. The paint and polished trimmings of the car reflected the light beautifully; but for me its glamor had departed. It after all was only a man-made machine of steel and iron without life or instinct. How could it compare with man's ancient companion endowed by the Creator with spirit and feeling? To me, still musing on the story of the old missions, it appeared also more appropriate to use the sentient creature in the service of the Creator. Of course, God can make use of any instrument to do His holy will; but I felt very certain that after fifty years I would not tell some young levite how an automobile had led me to a dying man praying for the Sacraments, nor would I drop a tear at the memory of its passing.

EDUCATORS AND EDUCATION. II.

By PAUL E. CAMPBELL, A.M., LITT.D., LL.D.

Jesus Christ is the Great Teacher of Mankind. His Church is the greatest educational institution in history. The conversion of Europe is the greatest single event in the history of education.

The teaching of Jesus Christ effected a profound change in the field of education. His Apostles began to preach and to teach throughout the world with a divine commission. Their first lesson was of the Redemption. They came with a sublime message of hope and salvation to all mankind. They told men of their lost birthright now restored to them, and joyfully accorded all men without exception the dignity of being sons of God by adoption and heirs to the kingdom of heaven. They gave the world a new conception of the dignity of human personality and of the sanctity of human life. The God whom they preached was no respecter of persons, and there were to be no castes or classes among men. All were bound by the ties of love for one another.

The Greeks and the Romans had known nothing of this. The cultured Greek had only contempt for the barbarian, and the Roman viewed all outside nations as possible subjects of Roman world power. But Christianity made of the world one vast school; all mankind became by divine commission its disciples. "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations," was the command of Christ. Nor was this commission given to the Apostles to expire with them. "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." The educational work of Christianity is thus endowed with perpetuity. This does not make of it a rigid system, knowing no change and no development. But in the light of the deposit of faith—certain unchangeable truths, belief in which is exacted of her followers—Christianity measured and determined the value of every theory and of every ideal of life and of education. In pursuance of His promise Christ entrusted the spread of His doctrine, not to books nor to schools of philosophy nor to the governments of the world, but to an organization—the Church—that spoke in His name and with His authority. The educational work undertaken by the Church was a monumental task. Previously no educational agency had undertaken such a task. But history over the space of

twenty centuries attests that no such agency ever accomplished so much for education in the highest sense. "Since the three hundred years of persecution," writes Macaulay, "the Roman Catholic Church has marched for fifteen hundred years at the head of human civilization, and has driven, harnessed to its chariot, as the horses of a triumphal car, the chief intellectual and material forces of the world; its greatness, glory, grandeur and majesty have been almost, though not absolutely, all that in these respects the world has to boast of."

We concede the high conception of personality attained by the Greeks. No one claims that it was perfect. Christianity set up the perfect ideal. Insisting upon the value of each human soul as created by God and destined for eternal life, the Church teaches that the State is not the supreme arbiter, and that service to the public weal is not the ultimate standard. The Church does not abrogate social and civic obligations, but subordinates them to the duties man owes to God. The fulfillment, sincere and complete, of his duties to God will insure fidelity to all other obligations, and thus results in the formation of the perfect citizen.

Woman was at once lifted to a higher plane and became the equal of man. She was no longer the mere creature of man's passion, a chattel to be bartered at will. Unity and indissolubility gave the marriage contract a new meaning, and the sacramental character sanctified the relationship and the life-work of man and wife. Parental authority was vindicated, but not allowed to run to the extreme of the *patria potestas*. The child possesses personality of equal worth with his elders. He has a right to education, and his parents have the correlative duty of providing it. The child is bound in reverence and filial love to respect and obey his parents. Mutual rights and obligations of parents and children thereby strengthen the ties of home life and consecrate the whole work of education in its very source.

Christianity gave to the world no mere abstract conception of her ideal of personality. She presented the actual, concrete life of her Founder who was absolutely perfect. Christ was God and at the same time the perfect man. The philosophers had formulated beautiful theories of knowledge and virtue. They never knew perfect fulfillment. But in Christ's own Person Christianity had the

actual realization of the highest ideals of personality. Christ could say to His disciples: "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John, xiv. 6). He could bid His disciples: "Follow Me." And only then are Christian teachers doing their work well when they can, after the example of the Great Teacher, stand before their disciples and bid them as Christ did: "Follow me." We learn by imitation. There is an imitative instinct in human nature. Christ did not disdain to appeal to it.

Christianity had the added advantage of supplying her followers with a body of truth to be accepted on faith. It was a body of truth beyond the domain of unaided human reason but full of import for life here and hereafter. Many truths that had troubled the pagan mind and stirred doubts innumerable in sincere inquirers were contained in the deposit of faith. The teaching of Christianity closed discussion in regard to these. The Christian might not question the existence of a personal God, the reality of His providence, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, and the resulting accountability of man to Divine Justice. Morality must mean the inner rectitude of the will, not mere outward conformity with conventions. The love of one's neighbor must be a practical thing expressing itself in deed and in truth. There were certain definite *credenda* and *agenda* to be accepted equally by all. The emphasis on spiritual aims gave new ideals to education. Nor did these spiritual aims reject or discard anything of value in the previous educational theory of the world. The Christian philosophy of education does not in any way jeopardize the temporal interests of man. The things of this life must serve to secure the things of eternity. Fundamentally the Christian believes in an eternal existence. He can therefore disregard neither the present nor the future life. But his education serves as Spencer's "preparation for complete living" only when it keeps in view the things of eternity, the life beyond the grave.

No synopsis of the history of education, however sketchy, could be complete without some study of the greatest of all teachers, Jesus Christ, the Man-God. He gave the world new ideals in culture and education that reshaped educational theory and practice. He Himself is the model of the perfect teacher. His infinite wisdom gave Him a complete mastery of the truths He taught, and His technique

of teaching was that of the perfect teacher. Teaching orally by personal instruction, He associated with His followers, won their confidence and met their special needs. He encouraged questions, but supposed the possession of knowledge previously acquired and built upon it. He adapted sublime and abstract truths to the capacity of human intelligence in plain and simple language intelligible to all. With forms of speech and illustrations that gave concrete and intelligible embodiment to His ideas, He provided the particular application of these truths to individual instances that would appeal to His hearers. He taught as one "having authority," and demanded acceptance of what seemed to His hearers "hard sayings," but He was Himself the living model of His teaching. He bade His disciples learn of Him meekness and humility of heart and fearlessly challenged them to follow Him.

Christ founded His Church to continue in perpetuity His work upon this earth. The commission to teach that He gave her was unlimited. But in the beginning the Church engaged only in moral and religious teaching. The catechumenal and the catechetical schools of those early ages did not touch upon the field of secular education. The catechumenal school provided the instruction and training required of the recipient of Baptism. The catechetical schools were the higher schools of philosophy and theology and gave that more advanced instruction in the Christian Faith which enabled their students to answer their pagan adversaries successfully. Neither of these types of schools concerned itself with the purely secular subjects. But it was not long before the watchmen on the towers of Israel perceived the dangers of a purely secular education. The circumstances of life in a pagan environment demanded that the priests and bishops of the Church provide the teaching in subjects not purely religious. The pagan nemesis stimulated the outstanding work in Christian education of such great teachers as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Chrysostom.

It was St. Basil the Great who drew perhaps for the first time the important distinction that should guide every Christian student even today in his study of secular writings: "We shall receive

gladly those passages in which they praise virtue and condemn vice. For just as bees know how to extract honey from flowers, which to men are agreeable only for their fragrance and color, even so here also those who look for something more than pleasure and enjoyment in such writers may derive profit for their souls. Now, then, altogether after the manner of bees must we use these writings, for the bees do not visit all the flowers without discrimination, nor indeed do they seek to carry away entire those upon which they light, but rather, having taken so much as is adapted to their needs, they let the rest go. So we, if wise, shall take from heathen books whatever befits us and is allied to the truth, and shall pass over the rest."

St. Basil profoundly affected educational thought and procedure of his own day and succeeding ages, particularly in the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance. The Renaissance—of which we shall treat *in extenso* later—professed to bring to the service of the Church the learning of classical antiquity; but this was precisely the work done in the service of religion by the great Fathers of the Oriental Church over one thousand years before the Renaissance. St. Gregory of Nyssa defined the Christian attitude towards pagan culture and philosophy; St. Gregory of Nazianzus brought all the culture and learning of his time to the service of the Church; and St. John Chrysostom declared in unmistakable terms the dangers of a purely secular education. "When the foundations of a building are sapped we should seek rather for architects to reconstruct the whole edifice, than for artists to adorn the walls. . . . The choice lies between two alternatives: a liberal education which you may get by sending your children to the public schools, or the salvation of their souls which you secure by sending them to the monks. Which is to gain the day, science or the soul? If you can unite both advantages, do so by all means; but if not, choose the more precious." It is well for the Catholic layman everywhere to know that the solicitude of the Church for the Christian education of her children is in no way a product of opposition to any present-day system of State schools. That solicitude has been characteristic of the Church in every age. It is but the exercise of a right and an obligation that is hers.

Contemporary with what we might call the entry of the Church

into the field of secular education—on the attainment of her freedom under Constantine—was the career of a great layman, Lactantius Firmianus, a teacher of rhetoric in Nicomedia, who after his conversion to Christianity won the esteem and confidence of the Emperor Constantine. The literary style and the eloquence of this great scholar earned him the title of the Christian Cicero. The great Fathers of the Western Church made their epoch memorable in the history of education. St. Ambrose, a scholarly lawyer of Milan, was elevated to the bishopric of that city. As an orator and a writer he promoted the interests of the Church and edified the faithful of all ages. He is remembered chiefly for his instructions to women and for his advocacy of the study of ancient literature. Many of his orations and sermons were later accepted as models of Latin composition in the schools of the Renaissance. St. Jerome is famous as a Scripture scholar and the author of the Latin Vulgate, the official version of the Scriptures approved by the Council of Trent. He is the first prominent advocate of what is now termed domestic science or home economics. After giving minute directions for the moral training of a certain young girl, he writes as follows: "Teach her also the working of wool, to hold the distaff, to place the basket in her lap, to ply the spindle, and draw out the threads. But let her have nothing to do with silk or golden thread. Let the clothes she makes be such as to keep out the cold, and not a mere compromise with nakedness. Her food should be a few herbs, and so forth, with sometimes a few small fishes. But not to go into details on this subject, of which I have elsewhere spoken more at length, let her always leave off eating with an appetite, so that she may be able to read and sing immediately." He tells us of his passionate devotion to the ancient classics, and that as a result of a dream he resolved to use them solely for Christian purposes. His *Liber de viris illustribus* is the first formal history of education from the pen of a Christian.

St. Augustine is most frequently commemorated as an illustrious convert. He was a great scholar, perhaps the greatest in the history of the Church, and has bequeathed to us in his writings much of educational value. His "Treatise on Christian Doctrine" presents his views on the right use of rhetoric, philosophy and pagan literature. If the philosophers have aught that is true and in harmony

with our faith, we must claim that as our own from those who have unlawful possession of it. "All branches of heathen learning have not only false and superstitious fancies and heavy burdens of unnecessary toil, which every one of us ought to abhor and avoid; but they contain also liberal instruction which is better adapted to the use of the truth, and some most excellent precepts of morality. . . . Now these are, so to speak, their gold and silver which they did not create themselves, but dug out of the mines of God's Providence, which are everywhere scattered abroad, and are perversely and unlawfully prostituting to the worship of devils. The Christian ought to take these away from them and devote them to their proper use in preaching the Gospel."

The Patristic epoch was a period of great glory. The Providence of God raises up in due time men of great erudition and profound scholarship in His Church, whose destiny is to promote the honor and glory of God. A St. Jerome is God's instrument to evolve a permanent, approved version of the Holy Scriptures. St. Augustine writes profoundly on the subject of Catholic theology and puts a great body of the Church's teaching into organized and scientific form. All the Fathers are conscious of the Church's mission to teach mankind. They draw on all sources of knowledge with minds set on extracting the truth from the sometimes vicious extravagances of pagan authors. As evidenced by their extant writings, these great men of God possessed a thorough knowledge of educational principles that we are sometimes asked to believe are modern developments.

"From the very beginning," writes Dr. McCormick, "the Church adopted in her organic teaching many of the principles which are today held essential in educational procedure." Her ritual appeals to the mind through the senses, requires the active participation of the faithful, and thus rouses sense, memory, imagination and feeling to the support of intellect and will. The principles that underlie all real teaching—appeal to the senses, association, apperception, expression, and imitation—are given practical application in the Church's Liturgy. The early Church did not theorize, nor did she indulge in psychological analysis. She followed the directions of her Divine Founder, and made the principles of the Gospels effective in the lives of men.

(To be Continued)

LITURGICAL NOTES

By THE BENEDICTINE MONKS OF BUCKFAST ABBEY

XII. Christus Rex

I. THE KINGSHIP OF CHRIST NO NOVELTY

Nothing could be further from the truth than to imagine, as some people might be tempted to do, that by instituting the new feast of the Kingship of Christ the Catholic Church sought, as it were, to bestow a new title or an additional dignity upon Him of whom St. Paul rightly says that He "has been appointed heir of all things, by whom also He (the Father) made the world" (Heb., i. 2). It cannot be too strongly laid down from the very start of these considerations that the Church never entertained such a design, for it is obviously impossible even for her ever to add one jot or tittle to the dignity of One of whom it is written that He is "the brightness of His (God's) glory and the figure of His substance and holding all things by the power of His word," and that "making purgation of sins, He sitteth on the right hand of the Majesty on high, being made so much better than the angels as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they" (Heb., i. 3, 4). Our Lord's Kingship, therefore, is no mere title fondly conceived by men and bestowed upon Him somewhat after the manner in which devotion lavishes upon Our Lady the titles and encomiums to be found in the Litany of Loreto. Christ's Kingship is nothing adventitious; on the contrary, it is necessary and, indeed, an essential attribute of His personality. In other words, Christ is King just because He is what He is.

What is more—and to overlook the point would be to miss the whole idea of His Kingship—we are not now speaking of the supreme over-lordship which belongs to the Son of God in virtue precisely of His divine sonship. Anyone can see that, by reason of the perfect equality that obtains between the three Divine Persons, the Eternal Word is Lord and King by exactly the same title as the Father to whom creation is peculiarly *attributed*, or as the Holy Ghost to whom the Scriptures attribute the ordering of the universe: *Spiritus ejus ornavit cælos* (Job, xxvii. 13). There is no distinc-

tion between Person and Person within the Blessed Trinity neither with respect to power and dignity nor as regards eternity and holiness.

The Kingship we claim for Jesus Christ is the Kingship of His humanity. In other words, it is a necessary consequence of the fact of the Incarnation that the nature so intimately linked to the Eternal Word as to constitute with it one infinitely adorable Person, has a strict right to share all the attributes and privileges of the Godhead. Hence, Catholic theology is in a position to claim for the humanity of the Son of God some things that are the natural attributes of the Godhead. Thus, we claim the title and dignity of King for the *Man Jesus*, because that man—the true Son of a Jewish Maiden—is also the true Son of God, for, say the Scholastics, God's own infinite *esse* is communicated to that ever-blessed humanity. In a word Jesus is God!

We are, therefore, entitled and even bound to apply to the Man Jesus the inspired texts of the Old and the New Testament by which His Kingship is clearly foretold and even graphically described.

It would take up too much space were we to attempt to give a full list of the numerous passages in the Bible which either plainly foretell or at least hint at the royal sovereignty of Him to whose coming the nations were to look forward during so many weary centuries. On his death bed Jacob drew back the veil that shrouded the future. He was vouchsafed a glimpse, from afar off, of the radiant personality of the Saviour, "in, whom all nations" were one day "to be blessed." However, the earliest and in many ways the most amazing prophecy of the Messiah's Kingship was destined to fall from the lips of that strange personage, Balaam, the son of Beor. Taking his stand upon one of the high peaks of the mountains of Moab which tower above the valley of the Jordan, he viewed the Israelites encamped over against Jericho, though as yet on the Moabite side of the river. He had been sent for in order that he might lay a curse upon the invaders who, on escaping from the desert of their forty years' wandering, had hitherto carried all before them. However, so far from cursing, Balaam felt inwardly compelled to foretell in glowing terms the future glories of the conquering people, the greatest of which is: "A Star shall rise out of Jacob and a sceptre shall spring up from Israel . . . Out of Jacob shall He come that shall

rule . . ." (Numbers, xxiv. 17, 19). The whole context, not to speak of the unanimous interpretation of the Fathers, makes it plain that, when he spoke thus, Balaam looked far beyond the temporal destinies, present or future, of the people the smoke of whose campfires he saw curling up into the blue sky of that wonderful valley. In no son of Israel were his words fulfilled except in Him who, though He came out of Bethlehem, has His origin in God's eternity. Thus it comes about that we must link together a prophecy uttered at the beginning of Israel's greatness with one spoken many centuries later: "Thou, Bethlehem Ephrata, art a little one among the thousands of Juda: out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be the ruler in Israel, and His going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity" (Mich., v. 2).

The chief exponent, so to speak, or the herald of Our Lord's kingly prerogatives, is a king himself, that royal singer from whose race the Messiah was destined to spring. It is a commonplace with theologians and commentators that David is, as it were, prophecy in action. His career, in not a few of its most important phases, was a prophecy in action of much that was to fall to the lot of Him who was to be born of the seed of David. Many Psalms which refer to incidents that actually happened in the life of the king of Israel, are at the same time prophecies of Our Lord's earthly career. There is no need to labor this point, for it is a commonplace in Catholic exegesis. For our present purpose it will be enough to refer to but one or two passages of the Psalter. At the opening, almost, of the Book we meet with the expression of a claim that, in its literal sense, could not by any manner of means be taken as literally referring to David: "The Lord hath said to me: Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession" (Ps. ii.). The words are sung at the beginning of the glorious Mass by which the Church honors, in the middle of the night, the birth of David's great Son in the darkness of the cave of Bethlehem. Only in that helpless Child, cradled in a manger, were these words truly fulfilled.

Even more emphatic, and certainly Messianic, is the whole of Psalm cix. We priests are familiar with this sublime canticle, too familiar perhaps, so that we sometimes fail to realize all it means.

We first hear one Person, the Lord, speaking to another whom David calls *his* Lord. The speaker invites the other Person to take his place at his right side. In other words, perfect equality obtains between these two divine Persons. "The Lord will send forth the sceptre of thy power out of Sion: rule thou in the midst of thy enemies. With thee is the principality in the day of thy strength, in the brightness of the saints: from the womb before the daystar I begot thee." Anyone can see at a glance that, though the Psalm is David's own composition and though he wielded his royal scepter in Sion where was the seat of his power, even that great king's marvellous career by no means exhausts the possibilities of this wonderful prophecy. As for the prophetic and Messianic character of the Psalm, no doubt is lawful for a Catholic, seeing that Our Lord Himself quotes it in order to substantiate the assertion made by Him that the Messiah would be of the house and race of David. Nor is the canticle a mere flight of the poetic imagination but the fruit of divine inspiration: *Quomodo David in spiritu vocat eum Dominum dicens: sede a dextris meis?*

If this isolated passage were deemed insufficient, one need only read those chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews in which St. Paul describes the priesthood of Our Lord. His teaching is mainly based upon this Psalm whose prophecy cannot have had for its direct object either David or Solomon, his son. Though the former gathered the materials, and the latter actually carried out the work of building the great temple of the Lord, neither of them could be styled a priest, since neither belonged to the tribe from which the Jewish priesthood was exclusively recruited.

The splendors of the kingdom of the Messiah are graphically told in Psalm lxxi. Here again it is idle to pretend that the picture painted in such glowing colors is no more than a somewhat high-flown description of the wealth and prosperity of Israel under David's wise son. Even the blessings of Solomon's reign were not such as those here enumerated: "He shall continue with the sun and before the moon, throughout all generations. He shall come down like rain upon the fleece and as showers falling gently upon the earth. In his days shall justice spring up and abundance of peace, till the moon be taken away. And he shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth . . . all kings of the earth shall

adore him: all nations shall serve him. . . . Let his name be blessed for ever more: his name continueth before the sun. And in him shall all the tribes of the earth be blessed: all nations shall magnify him."

Who would care to maintain that such words were spoken of mere man, or that they were partially accomplished in the splendors of Solomon's reign? The Scriptures tell us indeed that the latter's magnificence surpassed that of all kings: *magnificatus est rex Salomon super omnes reges universæ terræ*. But in this, as in his wisdom, he was but a *type* or prophetic shadow of the spiritual splendors of the reign of the King Messiah. In the Psalm both universality of dominion and eternity of rule is prophesied of the "king's son": Solomon's sway was over a small part of the world and ended within a comparatively short span of years.

Isaias also foretold the royal power of the Messiah. There is, first of all, the sublime prophecy on which the Church dwells so lovingly at Christmas time: "A Child is born to us and a son is given to us, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace. His empire shall be multiplied and there shall be no end of peace. He shall sit upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to establish it and strengthen it with judgment and with justice henceforth and forever" (Is., ix. 6, 7).

It must surely have been writing such as this that won for Isaias the title of "fifth evangelist." We have here a portrait of a ruler such as never sprang from any known royal race. Were one to speak in such terms even of Solomon, the result would be a grotesque caricature and a blasphemous travesty of one of the most inspired bits of sacred poetry. No, Solomon bears not even a remote resemblance to this picture, but we who live in the spacious days of the reign of the King Messiah know full well that such are indeed the features of our King, although His dominion is not so much over men's bodies as a spiritual sway over their souls. Again, when the prophet proclaims that "there shall be no end of peace," we cannot fail to recall to mind the promise of the King of peace: "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth do I give unto you" (John, xiv. 27).

We must not omit from this rapid survey of the Old Testament

one or two famous texts from the prophet Daniel. And here the very first prophecy that comes into one's mind is that wherein the seer interprets a mysterious and prophetic dream that had sorely troubled the slumbers of Nabuchodonosor. A huge statue, made partly of various metals and partly of clay, stood before the king, when presently a stone got detached from a mountain, crushed the statue, reduced it to powder, and itself grew and filled the whole earth. When the kingdom, typified by the various elements of which the image was made, shall have passed away, "the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall not be destroyed: and His kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people, and it shall break in pieces and shall consume all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever" (Dan., ii. 44).

A kingdom postulates a king: hence this description of the universality and eternity of the last kingdom, that of the Messiah, is also a prophecy of the only King whose rule knows no limits either in space or time. This feature of the Messianic Kingdom is described in one of the most exquisite bits of word-painting to be met with even in our sacred books: "I beheld in the vision of the night, and lo! one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and he came even to the Ancient of days, and they presented him before him. And he gave him power, and glory, and a kingdom: and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve him. His power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken away, and his kingdom that shall not be destroyed" (*ibid.*, vii. 13, 14).

In all these prophetic descriptions of the glory of the Messianic Kingdom, descriptions for the most part written many centuries before the fullness of time, we readily detect not only a community of thought but even a similarity of expression. The same idea is present to the mind of every one of the inspired writers. It would be a very hard task indeed, nay a hopeless one, for an exegete to discover in human history a man or a period in any way corresponding to these glowing pictures. When we read these promises in the full light of the Gospel, we cannot fail to see their perfect fulfillment in the King Messiah. In fact, we are far better able to gauge their significance than even those holy men of old who beheld from afar off—through the mists or at least the twilight of the Old Dispensation—those things which daily gladden our lives. Here we realize

the truth of the saying of St. Augustine when he explains the interdependence of the Old and the New Testament: *Quidquid in Veteri latet, in Novo patet.*

It is impossible not to quote here one of the most amazing prophetic texts of the Old Testament, for it is not only an assertion of the Messiah's Kingship, but it describes His character so precisely and minutely as to fill the reader with wonder and admiration. "Rejoice greatly," says Zacharias (ix. 9), "O daughter of Sion, shout for joy, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy King will come to thee, the Just and Saviour. He is poor, and riding upon an ass and upon a colt, the foal of an ass." As one reads the words, one might think they were penned, not at the time of the rebuilding of the temple under Nehemias and Zorobabel, but by one who had witnessed the sweet triumph of the first Palm Sunday.

From this astounding prophecy let us turn to the pages of the New Testament. Here it is impossible to pass even in brief review what St. Paul, above all other inspired writers, has told us concerning the Kingship of Christ. Nor can we allow ourselves to be delayed by the gorgeous scenes enacted in heaven and on earth of which the Apocalypse gives us so sumptuous and tantalizing a description. One text will be enough for our present purpose, for it is the weightiest of them all.

The time is night. The place is a small, square house built against the side of a hill and having a cave-like extension on that side. The dwelling is one of a group forming an obscure village the name of which seems to have been a byword, for they used to say in Judea: "Can any good come out of Nazareth?" Yes, even the Supreme Good, God's own Son, was about to come out of Nazareth. In the silent hours of that hallowed night a messenger from another world was in the very act of making known to a maiden of the village that she had been chosen by eternal Wisdom to confer a unique benefit upon the world by becoming the Mother of the long-expected Messiah. Without loss of her virginity she was to bear a Son—and what a Son! "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of David his father, *and he shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end*" (Luke, ii. 32, 33).

Jesus, the Son of Mary, is also the Son of the Most High. Hence

also He is a true King, a King that is not only after the manner of other rulers but the Lord of the universe, for, inasmuch as He is the Son of God, His power and dominion is coëxtensive with the sovereignty of His heavenly Father.

To sum up, Jesus Christ is King *ex officio*, so to speak, and by a natural and inevitable sequel of His divine Sonship. As Son of God He is Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the first born of creation, in whom creation is summed up and by whom it is explained inasmuch as in Him, and through Him and for Him were all things made in heaven and in earth.

The Kingship of Christ, of course, must not be understood in too materialistic a sense. Without doubt, as we have shown, Jesus is in very deed the Lord and King of all things, yet He has no hesitation in telling Pilate: *Regnum meum non est ex hoc mundo*. Earthly rulers need not be afraid of Him as a possible competitor. Once, during His mortal life after the multiplication of the loaves, the Jews, carried away by a sudden wave of enthusiasm, sought to proclaim Him their king. His answer was to flee into the loneliness of the mountains, for, as St. Augustine aptly remarks, it would be a very small thing indeed for the King of the ages to become the King of the Jews: *Quid magnum fuit Regi sæculorum regem fieri hominum?* (*Hom. III. Noct. of the feast*). All power, in heaven and on earth, was handed over to Jesus Christ: *Data est mihi omnis potestas in cælo et in terra*. On the other hand, He has never sought to rule in the purely natural scheme of things. "Though Christ was constituted King by God," says St. Thomas, "He nevertheless would not, whilst He lived on earth, administer a temporal kingdom in a temporal fashion: *Christus, quamvis esset Rex constitutus a Deo, non tamen in terris vivens terrenum regnum temporaliter administrare voluit*" (III, Q. lix, art. 4, ad 1).

The Kingship of Christ, even in the temporal order, cannot be called in question, for all things without exception were made subject to the whole Christ, the complete Christ, to Christ, that is, subsisting in the totality of His human and divine nature. Nothing could be more definite than the bold assertion of St. Peter: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know most certainly, that God hath made both *Lord* and *Christ* this same Jesus whom you have crucified" (Acts, ii. 36).

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MIXTURE OF COTTON SEED OIL AND OLIVE OIL IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS

Question: A cotton seed oil producer told me that he sells his oil to drug stores, and they mix a small percentage of olive oil (10 or 15%) with it and sell it as olive oil. If that oil is sold to cathedrals and blessed on Holy Thursday, are Confirmation and Extreme Unction valid when that oil is used?
SACERDOS.

Answer: The mixture described by our correspondent cannot be called olive oil, and is entirely invalid matter for the administration of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction. If the greater percentage was olive oil and the smaller quantity cotton seed oil, the mixture could not licitly be used, but it would be valid matter for the Sacraments. We need not prove that olive oil blessed by the bishop with the various formulas prescribed in the *Pontificale Romanum* is the necessary matter for the Sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction, for the Church has repeatedly declared those points of Catholic teaching. Pope Benedict XIV, in his Encyclical "Ex quo" (March 1, 1756), issued for the Oriental Churches in union with the Holy See, explicitly repeats the teaching on the necessity of using olive oil, and in Confirmation a mixture of olive oil and balsam, and though he permits the Orientals to retain their custom of adding other aromatic oils to the olive oil, the latter is pointed out as the absolutely necessary matter.

MANNER OF ACTION OF ECCLESIASTICAL CORPORATIONS

Question: If in a religious organization or in a diocese the Superior or the Ordinary is obliged by law to get the consent or the advice of a body of persons for the transaction of certain business, are the actions valid if they call only a few of the members of the board or must every one of them be called for the validity of the actions?
READER.

Answer: Canon 105, n. 2, prescribes that, if a body of persons is to be consulted, all who belong to that body must be convoked to give their opinion. The Superior or the Ordinary cannot act validly without asking the vote of the whole body, but he is not obliged to follow even the vote or opinion of the majority of the

body unless the law requires that he act only with their consent. Though the law does not explicitly state that, if one or several of the body of persons were absent because they were not notified, the ones neglected may appeal to the higher Superior to have the action of the board set aside as null and void, as is the case in election to ecclesiastical offices (cfr. Canon 162, § 2), there is no doubt that the action is illegal in the sense that it violates the right of the one or several persons to have a part in the proceedings. If there is no question of canonical election, we do not think that the injured members of the board can appeal for redress to the archbishop in the case of a diocesan board, for he would have no jurisdiction to intervene, and a complaint to the Holy See seems to be the only higher authority that could interfere. In the case of religious organizations, the higher Superiors—Provincials, Generals—usually have authority to intervene in the misconduct of the offices of lower Superiors.

BENEDICTION WITH THE OSTENSORIUM IN CONVENT CHAPELS

Question: Canon 1274 says that public exposition with the monstrance may be had in all churches on the Feast of Corpus Christi and every day within its Octave at Mass and at Vespers. Does this apply to semi-public chapels in convents, hospitals, etc., where the Blessed Sacrament is constantly kept? May chaplains of said institutions expose the Blessed Sacrament during the Mass in the morning, giving Benediction after the Mass, and again have Benediction in the evening? Some say that they may not because the Canon says *churches*. Others say they may have Benediction in the morning after Exposition during Mass, High or Low Mass, but not in the evening, unless the Sisters sing Vespers, for the Canon says *at Vespers*. Others maintain that “at Vespers” means in the evening or afternoon, for where in this country are Vespers sung during the Octave of Corpus Christi for eight successive days? These hold that if “Vespers” is so verbally interpreted, *inter Missarum sollemnia* must mean at least a High Mass. It would be well if there were uniformity in this matter. One chaplain says to the Sisters: “We cannot do it, it is not allowed.” Another, to their joy, says: “Certainly, the Church permits it, and desires it.”

CAPPELLANUS.

Answer: Public oratories enjoy the same privileges as churches in reference to ecclesiastical functions unless the rubrics restrict some function to certain churches (*e.g.*, cathedrals, parish churches, etc.). Concerning the two Expositions and Benedictions on the Feast of Corpus Christi and during the Octave, it seems that the

Code does restrict that function to churches and public oratories, for it speaks of churches only in connection with Corpus Christi and its Octave. Canonists hold that it extends to public oratories because of the wording of Canon 1191, § 1, which holds public oratories equal to churches in reference to liturgical functions. We have consulted several commentaries on the Code about this matter and find that the authors do not include semi-public oratories in the concession of Canon 1274, § 1, for the Feast of Corpus Christi and its Octave, and they should not, for the text of that Canon is against extending the concession to semi-public oratories. Some authors remark that the local Ordinary may grant semi-public oratories the privilege which the Code gives to churches and, by implication, to public oratories. The phrase “*inter Missarum sollemnia*” means a Solemn or an ordinary High Mass, and the term “*ad Vesperas*” means the chanting or recitation of the liturgical Hour of Vespers of the Divine Office.

RELATION OF SUBJECTS TO ECCLESIASTICAL SUPERIORS

Question: Would you please explain the nature and extent of the obedience which the priests owe to the Ordinary, to diocesan statutes and regulations? Is it canonical obedience or some other obligation that obliges the assistant priests to obey their pastor? VERITAS.

Answer: There is no need of discussing at length the obligations of ecclesiastical Superiors and subjects and the relation between them. All manuals of Moral Theology deal with the principles of the divine and the ecclesiastical law regulating those relations. Before God the ecclesiastical Superiors have a greater burden and are under more difficult obligations than their subjects. Outwardly in the eyes of the world the position of an ecclesiastical Superior may seem enviable, but before God, the just Judge, the duties of the Superior are far more numerous and burdensome than those of the humblest subject. Apparently the Superior has more privileges, rights, and freedom than the subject, but the truth of the matter is that every privilege and right imposes a corresponding duty or obligation, just as every duty or obligation implies a corresponding right. Before a conscientious Superior acts in any important matter, he must resort to prayer for divine light, to intense reflection and consultation with those whom the law appoints

as his advisers, and even after all that doubts and difficulties may torture his mind. The subject who sees only his side of the affair is liable to forget the hardships and trials of the man in office. The writer has served both in the capacity of subject and of Superior and can speak from experience, limited though it be. Some of our readers will say that our philosophizing is all right, but that there are ecclesiastical Superiors who are tyrants and care nothing for the feelings of their subordinates. Yes, history proves that there are such. However, we have known men who when subjects complained a great deal about their Superiors, and when they eventually became Superiors they were more harsh than the Superiors they complained about. The trouble is that some men are too sure that they are the only ones who have a conscience, and do not credit others with having a conscience.

The priest in the ceremony of his ordination solemnly promises obedience and reverence to the Prelate, his Ordinary. One will readily admit that the promise obliges the priest to obedience in all the affairs of religion and in his life and conduct, but it does not oblige him to submit to all sorts of injustice and oppression. Correct, but let him be very sure about the injustice. As long as human beings take the place of God in the management of human affairs, it is possible that human shortcomings enter into their doings, and it is also possible that at times the subject has little or no redress for the injustice that he suffers. Nevertheless, the spiritually minded man knows what his divine Model, Jesus the God-Man, suffered from the creatures whom He had placed in positions of power and authority. He will, therefore, rather suffer than throw away the priestly vocation and the tremendous powers of the priesthood envied by the angels; he will rather sacrifice himself than bring disgrace on the Church which Christ established with His sufferings and death.

Our correspondent wants to know the reason why the assistant priests are obliged to obey their pastor. Indirectly the obligation arises from the promise of obedience made at the ordination, for the Ordinary appoints the pastor and gives him charge over the parish and over the assistant priests. Besides, the law subordinates them to the pastor, and finally the assistant priests are members of

the household of the pastor and owe him respect and obedience as the head of the household.

CONCERNING THE INDULGENCE FOR SAYING THE ROSARY IN THE
PRESENCE OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Question: Can the Plenary Indulgence be gained by reciting five decades of the Holy Rosary at a Mass from the Consecration to the Communion, though the Mass is not said in a chapel where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, and can the Indulgence be gained in a chapel or oratory which is separated from the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament by a wall? Is it necessary to meditate on the mysteries of the Holy Rosary in order to gain the indulgence?
RELIGIOSUS.

Answer: The Letters Apostolic conceding the Plenary Indulgence require: (1) that the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist be received; (2) that the person recite at least five decades of the Rosary before the Blessed Sacrament exposed for veneration or reserved in the tabernacle (Pope Pius XI, September 4, 1927; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XX, 376). As the text of the concession evidently supposes a church or chapel where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, we do not think that the presence of the Blessed Sacrament on the altar during the Mass is included in the above-mentioned concession of the Plenary Indulgence. Concerning the question whether the indulgence can be gained in an oratory or chapel attached to the one where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, it depends on the location of the oratory and the way it is separated from the church or chapel in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. Some canonists have asserted that, if a wall separates the oratory (*e.g.*, the choir where the religious community recites the Divine Office may be like a separate chapel), the Indulgence cannot be gained there. However, the Divine Office is supposed to be said (if there is question of the Canonical Office of communities that have choir duty) before the Blessed Sacrament, and, if the choir chapel is sufficiently connected with the main church or chapel by a door or window, there is no reason to assert that the indulgence for saying the Rosary in presence of the Blessed Sacrament cannot be gained there.

As to the other question, whether meditation on the mysteries of the Rosary is necessary for the gaining of the plenary indulgence,

the Letters Apostolic by which the indulgence was granted speak of a "devout recitation." The very definition of the devotion of the Holy Rosary given by Pope Leo XIII includes, besides the recitation of the Our Father and ten Hail Marys for each decade, the devout meditation on the mystery of salvation mentioned in each decade. The Holy Rosary does not merely consist in the recitation of a definite number of Our Fathers and Hail Marys, but in the meditation on each of the mysteries. Therefore, that meditation is required in any of the indulgences granted in connection with the recitation of the Holy Rosary.

DELEGATION FOR ASSISTANCE AT MARRIAGE

Question: A certain pastor went away for a few days during the week and left a visiting priest, a friend of his, in charge of the parish. He did not ask the chancery office for permission, because there is no need to do so when the pastor goes away for less than a week, and he did not report to the chancery office the name of the priest he left in charge. The pastor knew that a couple were to be married but he expected to be back in time to marry them himself; in fact, he did not want to ask the priest to attend to the affair in order not to inconvenience him any more than necessary. In the meantime, the parties came before the pastor returned, and the priest left in charge thought that, so long as the pastor had arranged for everything, he intended to have the visiting priest assist at the marriage. Was the visiting priest authorized to assist, or is the marriage invalid because of lack of authorization?

PAROCHUS.

Answer: The law requires that, when the pastor leaves the parish for more than a week (*ultra hebdomadam*), he must get permission from the Ordinary and appoint a substitute, whose name is to be sent to the Ordinary who has the right to accept or reject the substitute. When the Code speaks of an absence for less than a week, it says that the pastor must provide a priest for the needs of the people, especially when peculiar circumstances of the parish make such provision necessary (cfr. Canon 465, § 6), but it does not demand that he get the approval of the priest from the Ordinary for a few days' absence. There is no doubt that the substitute approved by the Ordinary has full parochial jurisdiction during the absence of the pastor; he can therefore witness marriages in that parish and delegate other priests to witness them in the same parish.

The Holy See has decreed that the substitute appointed by the pastor who with permission of the Ordinary leaves the parish for longer than one week, cannot validly assist at marriages until he has been approved as substitute by the Ordinary. The pastor can delegate all the parochial jurisdiction to another priest unless the law explicitly forbids delegation of some of the powers (cfr. Canon 199, § 1). The Code forbids all general delegation for assistance at marriage (cfr. Canon 1096, § 1), and declares attempted general delegation invalid. From the Declaration of the Holy See of July 14, 1922, that a substitute of the pastor cannot validly assist at marriage before he has been approved by the Ordinary, one must conclude that it is beyond the power of a pastor to appoint of his own authority a substitute who has all the powers of a pastor. That seems logical, for, while he can delegate his powers except those which the Code does not permit to be delegated, he cannot appoint a temporary pastor in his parish without the authority of the Ordinary, who alone has authority to appoint pastors. We conclude, therefore, that the appointment during the absence of a few days does not authorize the priest to assist validly at marriages.

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUR READERS

Hospital Chaplains

The article appearing in the August issue of the REVIEW entitled "Hospital Chaplains" by William Schaefer is very timely. There is, indeed, a great deal of spiritual work to be done for the patients in our Catholic hospitals, and therefore the need of active, zealous priests. However, I believe the author has overlooked a very important phase of the hospital chaplain's work, and that is the care for the spiritual welfare of student nurses. I have had a little experience in hospital work. To my mind the spiritual welfare of the nurses is being sadly neglected, especially where there is no resident chaplain. Many of these young girls are graduates of public high schools, and have had little or no religious training. When they assume the duties of their profession as graduates of a Catholic hospital, they are expected to be firmly grounded in the principles of their religion. But if, throughout their course of training, they received no other instruction except that which the very busy nuns were able to impart to them, it is to be feared that they will be a credit neither to the Catholic Church nor to the institution which trained them in their profession.

Moreover, in many States a course in psychology is demanded in the curriculum of training schools. Who is to give the instructions in psychology if not the chaplain? In the State of Pennsylvania lectures on the following subjects are demanded: "The Machinery of the Mind," "Sensation," "Perception and Observation," "Instincts and Habits," "Feelings and Emotions," "Attention and Memory Association," "The Imagination," "Thinking," and "Education of the Will." It will be readily seen that it is not safe to let *anybody* give these lectures. Nor are Catholic hospitals all located near Catholic colleges where teachers of psychology are available.

There is a certain fascination for the maturing mind about the word, psychology. Since nurses are expected to know something of this science, they will seek out literature on the subject. But the field of modern psychology is largely occupied by the disciples of Freud. Hence, too, the necessity of guidance in the selection of books for supplementary reading. I have known Catholic nurses to possess and study widely advertised pamphlets on Psychology and Hygiene and kindred subjects, which were written by men and women who deny the very existence of a life principle different from that of the beasts.

The Association of Catholic Hospitals and Nurses' Training Schools is awake to the need of greater spiritual care for the souls of the many young women in our Catholic hospitals. But there are still many institutions where these girls are deprived of instruction, conferences, so-

dality influence, and the strong urge of frequent Confession and Communion. In every such instance this neglect may be traced to an old and infirm chaplain or to the fact that there is no resident chaplain.

The need of resident chaplains for hospitals—for priests who are active and zealous—is apparent too, if one considers the spiritual needs of the nuns themselves. These consecrated women are exposed to many more dangers in the hospitals than in their convents. And yet they have not the same spiritual advantages. Monthly conferences for the nuns as a means of helping them to advance in spiritual perfection are more than desirable.

Considering all the opportunities offered the chaplains for apostolic labor in hospitals as pointed out by Father Schaefer, and adding to these the great good they may accomplish for nurses as well as for nuns, there can be little doubt but that hospital chaplains should be men of character, of zeal and of boundless ambition for the welfare of souls. Perhaps if a "living wage" were offered to the chaplains, men of this type could be secured and would not need to fear the taunts of the diocesan pastors.

GEORGE T. SCHMIDT.

St. Mary's Church, Scranton, Pa.

CASUS MORALIS

The Obligation of the Marriage Debt

By LEO P. FOLEY, C.M., S.T.D.

Case.—In the course of a mission John, a missionary, has a penitent, Bertha, who confesses to him that she has been away from the Sacraments for over seven years. In explanation of her negligence, she insists that, though she is most desirous of receiving the Sacraments, she had been refused absolution repeatedly because she will not have intercourse with her husband. For months together she has refused to render the debt, inasmuch as she experiences no pleasure whatever in marital relations but only a deep and ever-growing disgust. Under questioning, however, the confessor elicits from her an admission that the underlying reason of her refusal is her fear of bearing children. All during the term of pregnancy she is simply tortured with anxiety, and, though her bearing of children twice in the past had no lasting ill-effect, yet it was a very painful experience and in her mind, at least, accompanied by grave danger to her life. She goes on to tell the confessor that, though she sees her obligation clearly because of her marriage vow, yet she does not understand how God could exact this duty of her, when it is so difficult—in fact, for her impossible. Further, she feels that God has deserted her; she has worried so much about the matter and has been so discouraged by the repeated failure to obtain absolution that she has been tempted frequently in desperation to commit suicide and so end it all. The confessor, having heard her story, urges her strongly to renew her confidence in God and to the observance of her duty to her husband. He finally brings her to promise, not that she will render the debt (that, she says, she could not sincerely promise), but to make fervent use of prayer to overcome her fears and to make a consistent effort to live up to her duties. On this promise, John absolves her and permits her to receive Holy Communion. Did John act rightly in granting her absolution?

Solution.—I. Theologians commonly teach that a woman is not excused from rendering the debt merely because she fears the difficulties of childbirth, but only when childbirth is attended by unusual suffering and serious danger to the life of the mother. As to the reason first alleged by the woman, disgust in the use of marriage, it need not be discussed at length, since it was manifestly untrue on her own admission. There are instances where the husband renders

intercourse extremely unpleasant for the wife and may amount to a condition that his asking is unreasonable. Hence his request cannot bind the wife to render the debt until she is assured that he intends to change his manner of conducting conjugal relations. But in our case it appears Bertha is subjected to no more than the ordinary inconveniences of married life and the usual difficulties of having children. *Objectively*, then, she is clearly obliged to render the debt to her husband. And since her refusal to do so over the period indicated by her amounts to a serious violation of her husband's right, we have here a penitent who refuses to fulfill a grave obligation, recognized too by her as such, and thus she must be judged as lacking the proper dispositions for absolution.

II. But, considered *subjectively*, the matter takes on an entirely different aspect. We may admit, if you will, that Bertha considerably exaggerates her fears and anxieties. We may even go further and suppose (as sometimes happens in like instances of persons who meet with difficulties in living up to the obligations of their state of life) that she even takes a melancholy pleasure in picturing herself as placed in a rather unique relation to her Creator, as if God did not fully appreciate her condition and did not foresee her particular case when He established the laws of married life. We will grant this, but still the fact remains that Bertha is suffering from an erroneous conscience, which arose from her neglect to take the proper means to allay this inordinate fear of anything that threatens her life. It is more properly a case of prejudice or repugnance rather than strict error about an obligation, but it is none the less truly invincible as far as natural means are capable of bringing her to a better state of mind. In the grace of God lies the only hope of changing her and procuring for her the courage to accept her obligations despite the recognized difficulties and dangers. His grace gives light that penetrates even the darkest clouds of fear and its impulse moves the will against that strongest of our inclinations, the instinct of self-preservation. For obtaining that grace, no more effective means is available than Bertha's return to the reception of the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion. This will be more effective than prayer unaided by the Sacraments, for only in her restoration to something like the normal practice of her

religion will her mind be relieved and grace working with nature correct her errors and overcome her fears. And may we not safely assume that in all her confusion of mind she sincerely wills to do what God demands of her? Thus, *implicitly* she accepts and proposes to live up to the very obligation which, because of an invincible repugnance, she seems so *explicitly* to refuse to fulfill. Hence, she is not certainly indisposed to receive absolution. If he will, let the confessor absolve her conditionally.

III. The further question remains of the injury done to Bertha's husband by the temporary and tacit permission given her to refuse him his just right. The answer is that under the circumstances he can hardly be reasonably unwilling to forego his right for the time required that grace may work this change. This is particularly true in this case, where he has been unable to obtain his right, save at rare intervals, over a long period. For in thus allowing Bertha to follow her erroneous conscience for a season, there will be found the only remedy against her husband's continued, indefinite deprivation of conjugal intercourse.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION ON CATHOLIC UNIVERSITIES

The Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, has published this Constitution for the purpose of establishing uniform rules and regulations for all Catholic universities and Catholic faculties at non-ecclesiastical universities throughout the world. The whole issue of the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* of July 1, 1931, is taken up with the Constitution (pages 241-262), and with a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities (pages 263-284), which gives specific rules for the enforcement of the Constitution.

In the introductory paragraphs the Holy Father points out how the Catholic Church has from its very beginning favored the progress of human knowledge, for it is one of the fundamental beliefs of the Church that human reason and faith do not and cannot contradict each other, but that on the contrary one helps the other. Then he reminds us of the first great Christian schools of the second century at Smyrna, Rome, Alexandria and Edessa, and of the great Fathers and ecclesiastical writers of the third century who were admired in their day for their secular knowledge as well as for their profound exposition of the teachings of the Old and the New Testament. After the age of the Fathers the schools at the monasteries and cathedrals kept alive the study of arts and sciences. The Catholic schools at monasteries and churches were the only ones that survived the storms of the migration of nations and the invasion of the cultured nations by the barbarians. The Councils at Rome in 1326 and 1353 passed the law that at all bishoprics and in other places where it was deemed necessary diligent care should be taken to appoint teachers and doctors for the teaching of letters and the liberal arts. In the Middle Ages the Church established the great universities which became famous throughout the world. Of the fifty-two universities established before the year 1400 not less than twenty-nine were founded directly by the Popes, and ten more were founded simultaneously by the kings or princes and by the Popes.

In the course of time, the civil governments withdrew many universities from the tutelage of the Church, and, though the Church

had been to a great extent deprived of her freedom and of financial means, she nevertheless continued to establish schools of higher learning even in the missions in heathen lands. The great libraries of the Church, beginning in ancient days with that of Cæsarea, continuing with the Ambrosian and Vatican libraries, show what great care the Church took to perpetuate the monuments of human knowledge. Wherefore, it is mere malice to charge the Catholic Church with having made efforts to keep the human mind in ignorance. The Church does not fear the persecutor who kills her children by the thousands, nor the heresies which bring out the teaching of the Church with greater clarity, but she does fear ignorance of the truth. As early as the second century Tertullian said that the enemies of the Church cease to hate her when their ignorance ceases. Then the Holy Father comes to rules and regulations which are to be followed by all Catholic universities and by the Catholic Faculties at universities which are not strictly speaking church universities.

There are six titles or main headings: (1) General Norms; (2) Persons and Government; (3) Method of Teaching, Curricula, Disciplines and Examinations; (4) Conferring of Degrees; (5) Classrooms, Library, Laboratories, Salaries of Professors and Officials; (6) Transitory Rules.

The last title is of special interest because it decrees when and how the new Constitution is to go into effect, and it also gives us to understand the importance that the Holy See attaches to the Constitution, saying that, if the Catholic Universities have not conformed their own Constitutions to the new rules and exhibited them to the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities before June 30, 1932, they automatically forfeit the right to confer degrees in the name of the Holy See. The entire Constitution becomes obligatory with the beginning of the scholastic year 1932-1933; some articles of the Constitution are to go into force with the beginning of the scholastic year 1931-1932. All laws and customs now in existence and contrary to the present Constitution, whether they be universal or particular laws and customs, even those that are not ordinarily revoked unless mentioned specially and individually, are abrogated by the Constitution. Abrogated are also all privileges granted by the Holy See to physical or moral

persons which are contrary to the Constitution (May 24, 1931; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 241-262).

REGULATIONS BY THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF SEMINARIES AND
UNIVERSITIES BASED ON THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION
CONCERNING CATHOLIC UNIVERSITIES

The Holy Father says in Article 12 of his Constitution that the ordinances to be published by the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities for the purpose of properly putting into effect the laws of the Constitution must be observed. The Supreme Pontiff himself confirmed and approved the ordinances, and commanded them to be published.

The Papal Constitution together with the ordinances of the Sacred Congregation are to be the main portion of the Constitutions of all Catholic Universities. The particular needs of each (according to the circumstances and requirements of the various countries) are to be inserted in the Constitutions, but the Holy See demands that nothing contrary to the new Constitution and the new ordinances be inserted in the individual Constitutions of Catholic Universities. The text of the Papal Constitution and of the ordinances is drawn up in such a manner that the special requirements, in addition to the present set of laws and ordinances, can be easily added. If some state regulation conflicts with the present law so that a Catholic University could not without danger of losing its government charter introduce the rules of the Holy See together with the state regulations, a report must be made to the Holy See to get a special ruling on the matter.

The ordinances of the Sacred Congregation were issued on June 12, 1931 (*Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXIII, 263-284).

STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., LL.B.

Homiletic Part

Sermon Material for the Month of October

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Wedding Garment

By LAMBERT NOLLE, O.S.B.

"Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having on a wedding garment?" (Matt., xxii. 12).

- SYNOPSIS: I. *Explanation of the parable in today's Gospel.*
II. *The Marriage Feast of the Lamb.*
III. *Our share in the Marriage Feast.*
IV. *Conclusion.*

We are justified in asking how it was that the beggars who were gathered up at the highways and byways and were dragged into the marriage feast were able to procure special garments, and that the only one of them who did not have one was promptly turned out. The explanation is simple if we consider the custom of the country. At that time it was understood that, when a man of position gave a dinner, he would be dressed in a white linen garment, very much like a priest's alb. We know that the rich man who despised and neglected the poor Lazarus dressed himself in garments of the finest linen. Not only that, but such a host would also provide each one of his guests with a similar garment and make him a present of it. A guest entering the house would go first to the cloak room, where he would wash his hands and head from the dust and a servant would wash his feet. Then he would be offered a wide and long linen garment, which he could adjust by means of a girdle. When, therefore, the poor men from the streets had thus been dressed and groomed, their rags would be hidden, and they would look quite respectable. It was, therefore, a gross insult to the king that one of the beggars should enter the dining room without cleaning himself and without putting on the garment provided for him. We can easily see that this parable has a practical meaning for us, and that it contains one of the conditions which we must fulfil if we want to take part in the great marriage feast in heaven.

THE MARRIAGE FEAST OF THE LAMB

St. John was favored with a glance into heaven, so that he might describe to us the marriage feast of the Lamb (Apoc., xix. 6 sqq.). He heard a voice like that of a great multitude, and of many waters, and of a great thunder saying: "Let us be glad and rejoice and give glory to the Lord Our God; for the marriage feast of the Lamb is come." And he saw the bridegroom "sitting on a white horse; his eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many diadems, and he was clothed with a garment sprinkled with blood; and his name was called: The Word of God." The Bride, too, had prepared herself (v. 8.): "It was granted to her, that she should clothe herself with fine linen, glittering and white." And who is this Bride? St. Paul tells the Ephesians that the Bride of Christ is our Holy Mother the Church (v. 22 sqq.): "He loves his Church and delivered himself up for her, that he might sanctify her by the laver of water in the word of life; that he might present her to himself, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that she should be holy and undefiled." Thus, we see that the fine and white and shining linen is the gift of the Bridegroom Himself, and is the result of His own self-sacrifice. And what about the guests and friends of the King and of the Bridegroom? They too appear in white garments. "The armies (in heaven following the bridegroom) on white horses are clothed in fine linen, white and clean; the ancients sitting on their thrones too had white garments, and golden crowns on their heads" (iv. 4). The innumerable multitude "of all nations and tribes, and peoples, and tongues, standing before the throne with palms in their hands were also clothed with white robes (vii. 9). Again, "white robes were given to every one of the Martyrs that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony they had held" (vi. 9, 11). And how were the white garments of the heavenly guests produced? "They had washed their robes and had made them white in the Blood of the Lamb" (vii. 14). This gave them access to and the right of citizenship in the holy city. Therefore, the Angel in the name of the Lord said to St. John: "Blessed are they that wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb: that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter by the gate into the city." Thus we see how the parable in the Gospel today is a

symbol of the marriage feast which the Heavenly Father prepared for His Son, and which began on the day of His glorious Ascension, when for the first time the Church Triumphant was introduced as Bride into the Heavenly Jerusalem and the Saints from Limbo were invited as guests to sit in the places of the fallen Angels, and the King's Son Himself went round ministering unto them (Luke, xii. 37).

OUR SHARE IN THE MARRIAGE FEAST

We shall naturally ask ourselves: "Does this mean that now, after the Bridegroom has entered with His guests, the door is locked, and that we, like the foolish virgins, are outside and will not be admitted to the great feast?" No, for when St. John saw this vision Our Lord was already in heaven and the Beloved Disciple was still on earth. Surely, he was not a foolish virgin, and he had Our Lord's promise that he would sit at His table and also judge one of the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke, xxii. 29). Therefore, he counts himself and us amongst those whom the Lamb washed from our sins in His blood (i. 5); and the Angel made a promise to us on behalf of God, saying (iii. 5): "He that shall overcome shall thus be clothed in white garments, and I will not blot out his name from the book of life, and I will confess his name before My Father and before His angels."

But what is that white garment which we must wear in order that we may be admitted at the gate of the palace of the Heavenly King? It is clear that the garment is not something merely external, since the heavenly king would behold the unclean interior and would reject us; for nothing unclean or defiled can enter His glorious presence. We must, as St. Paul says (Heb., x. 22), have "our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." We must be cleansed through and through. That white garment is to be like that of Our Lord in his Transfiguration. It was his ordinary garb, but that same light, coming from His soul and making His countenance shine with the brightness of the sun, lit also up His garments and made them as white as snow. In the same way, our souls being penetrated by the light of God's own holiness—that is, by sanctifying grace—will also shine in presence of the Saints, and will after the resurrection of the body also light up our human flesh and bones, so that our

whole nature will be transfigured like Our Lord on Mount Thabor. We know, therefore, what is required of us to be admitted to the heavenly marriage feast. We must preserve and increase sanctifying grace in us; for "as star differs from star, so it will be in the resurrection of the dead" (I Cor., xv. 41), that is, those who possess more of that heavenly gift and use it better by charity, will shine more brightly than others, and therefore give more glory to God and more joy to the other guests. On the contrary, those who do not cultivate the heavenly treasure soil themselves by their very idleness and contempt of God's gift, and run the risk of being turned away from the banquet of the King.

We have one great means of acquiring, preserving and increasing within us the beauty of the heavenly wedding garment. We have the Sacrament of Penance, which is the cleansing of our conscience, and we have Holy Mass and Holy Communion in which the heavenly Bridegroom gives us a foretaste of His heavenly banquet and strengthens us so that we, having been cleansed by Him, may keep our souls unstained, and as "pursuers of good works" may become acceptable to Our Saviour (Tit., ii. 14).

CONCLUSION

By the white garments of her priests and the ministers in the sanctuary, Holy Church reminds us of the necessity of keeping our souls unstained. Also at Baptism she gave each of us a white garment, the symbol of our soul being washed in the blood of the Lamb by that holy Sacrament. But originally there was another meaning in it. For when the adults were baptized in Easter Night and received the white garment, it was on the same occasion their Communion garment, and they wore it during the whole week. We are reminded of this by the Easter Hymn *Ad regias Agni dapes*:

Now at the Lamb's high royal feast
In robes of saintly white, we sing.

But it was not meant that the newly baptized should lose or diminish the whiteness of their souls afterwards, but rather they should grow in holiness.

And as all the faithful are to be a "royal priesthood" (I Peter, ii. 9), we may all apply to ourselves the explanation which some

medieval writers give of the symbolical meaning of the alb. They say: "Its whiteness covers the breast to remind us that the intentions of our hearts must be pure; the neck, that we should willingly submit to the yoke of obedience; the middle part of the body, that we should keep down the desires of the flesh by temperance and purity; the arms that we should become more holy by works of charity; the knees that we should be instant in prayer; the legs that we should not be self-complacent, but try to make progress in virtue." If we apply and practise this advice in our daily lives, we may hope that by God's help we may become more pleasing to Him, and not unworthy to be admitted to the eternal marriage feast of the Lamb of God. Amen.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Extreme Unction

By THOMAS P. PHELAN, LL.D.

"Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord" (James, v. 14).

SYNOPSIS: *Introduction: God's Love.*

I. Christ's Compassion.

II. The Last Journey.

III. Extreme Unction, a Sacrament.

IV. The Effects of the Sacrament.

V. Delay in Administering the Sacrament.

VI. Physical Results.

God's infinite love for His creatures is manifest from the cradle to the tomb. When man enters this world, the waters of regeneration wash away original sin and restore to him his ancient heritage, making him a child of God and heir to the kingdom of heaven. When actual sin disfigures man's immortal soul, the Blood of Christ laves it from every stain. When spiritual hunger enfeebles him, the Heavenly Manna restores his health and vigor. Confirmation transforms him from a coward to a valiant soldier, Matrimony propagates the human race, Holy Orders raises up other Christs to teach, to preach, and to sacrifice. All through man's exile, the grace

merited on Calvary by the effusion of the Divine Blood flows into his soul in abundant streams, routing Satan and his cohorts, dissipating the allurements of the world, overcoming the sting of the flesh. And when the fatal hour approaches and the enemy makes the last strenuous onslaught on his faith, God gives man the Sacrament of Extreme Unction to hearten him in that precarious moment, to strengthen him in the final combat, to sustain his agony with fortitude, to prepare for his judgment.

CHRIST'S COMPASSION

God sent His only begotten Son into this world to save His children from slavery, to reopen heaven, to restore them to their ancient heritage. "For God so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in Him may not perish, but may have everlasting life. For God sent not His only Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world may be saved by Him" (John, iii. 16-17). The spiritual regeneration of His children was Christ's first obligation, but His heart bled for their bodily afflictions and sorrows: "And Jesus went about . . . teaching and preaching . . . the gospel of the kingdom; and healing all manner of sickness and every infirmity among the people" (Matt., iv. 23) "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaias saying: He took our infirmities and bore our diseases" (Matt., viii. 17). He raised Lazarus to life; He cleansed the lepers; He gave sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb; He healed the centurion's son, multiplied the loaves and fishes, changed water into wine, calmed the waves and the storm. "For we have not a high priest who cannot have compassion on our infirmities but one tempted in all things like as we are, without sin" (Heb., iv. 15). For Christ was born in poverty, reared in obscurity, died in ignominy. He was rejected by His own people, denounced as an imposter, classed with robbers, scourged, spit upon, crowned with thorns, and finally executed as a felon and a traitor.

THE LAST JOURNEY

Death is one of the punishments imposed on Adam's children through his disobedience: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to the earth out of which thou wast taken;

for dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return" (Gen., iii. 19). In every man's life there comes a moment when he must bid farewell to relatives and friends, abandon the quasi-honors and pseudo-dignities of life, renounce the baubles of wealth and society, for which perhaps he has bartered his eternal inheritance. Stripped of the glitter and tinsel of the world's gaudy apparel, he must appear in all his poverty and iniquity before the Just Judge. The sceptered monarch ruling the destinies of nations, the Croesus humored in every whim and caprice, the philosopher analyzing the most abstruse problems, the lowliest cottager digging and delving to eke out a precarious existence—all must answer the summons of that inexorable enemy, death. The saint, the sinner, alike await the inevitable hour. "Man's days are as grass, as the flower of the field so shall he flourish" (Ps. cii. 15). What are his thoughts when the pale angel of death stands at his bedside, the yawning gates of eternity ajar, and he waiting till the hinges turn for him! Death recalls the beauties of salvation, the transgressions of the past, the sinful acts of rebellion against his future Judge. Little wonder, the words of Ecclesiasticus haunt his uneasy pillow: "In all thy works remember thy last end, and thou shalt never sin" (Eccles., vii. 40). What a frightful situation even for the hardened sinner, steeped in iniquity, plunged in despair! If he repent not, how awful his end!" It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Heb., x. 31). But the just man, the repentant sinner, the returned prodigal, welcome the summons of the Master. "O, death where is thy victory?" (I Cor., xv. 55). It is the fruition of their hopes and wishes, the goal of an entire life, happiness with God in the mansions of the blessed.

EXTREME UNCTION, A SACRAMENT

That Christ instituted Extreme Unction as a Sacrament to invigorate the passing soul on its journey to eternity, is a dogma of our faith. We have the words of St. James: "Is any man sick amongst you? Let him bring in the priests of the church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: . . . and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him" (James, v. 14). In the last sentence the Apostle ascribes to Extreme Unction the nature and efficacy of a Sacrament. The remission of sins would be im-

possible unless the Author of all grace attached grace to the sign or action. Likewise the outward signs are present—the oil consecrated by the bishop, the anointing of the senses, the prayers of the priest. Finally, the teachings of the Church and the use of this Sacrament since Apostolic days, the decisions of the Councils of Châlons, Worms, Constance, Florence, and especially Trent (which pronounced anathema on him who denied the authenticity of this Sacrament), are patent proofs that from the infant days of the Church Extreme Unction has always been regarded as a Sacrament founded by Christ. The so-called Reformers of the sixteenth century reduced the number of Sacraments from seven to two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and Luther, to justify his contentions, rejected the entire Epistle of St. James as "an epistle of straw." The Universal Church has never wavered from the Apostolic teachings, and even the Eastern schismatics of the early centuries—the *Orthodox* churches, as they style themselves—maintain in their profession of faith that Christ founded seven Sacraments and refused all union with the Anglican bodies except on this basis. Olive oil is the matter of Extreme Unction—olive oil consecrated by the bishop. As oil has always been regarded as most efficacious in soothing bodily pain, in restoring health and vigor, giving light and reducing fatigue, the consecrated oil soothes and alleviates the pain and anguish of the soul at the hour of death. Apostolic tradition has handed down the form observed by the Church of Rome, the mother and mistress of all Churches. A few words may have been altered by different Churches, but the meaning is substantially the same. In its administration special rites and certain prayers are employed, for the sufferer needs the aid of prayer in his agony. All present at the last anointing, especially the priest, should pour forth fervent aspirations recommending the passing soul to the mercy of God.

THE EFFECTS OF THE SACRAMENT

Extreme Unction produces many salutary effects, both physical and spiritual. It cleanses the soul from the residue of sin, restores peace of mind, banishes tepidity and sloth, overcomes insidious and violent temptations, and protects the soul at the moment of death. It imparts calmness, courage, confidence, and resignation to the will of God. It purifies the soul from venial sin, and even from mortal

transgression in certain cases—as in unconsciousness, speechlessness, ignorance of the language, and other circumstances enumerated by the Council of Trent. It imparts to the sick man patience and fortitude to withstand his crosses. It not only burns away the vestiges of sin and purifies the soul, but routs the minions of the Evil One. Finally it often restores health and vigor, as St. James affirms: “And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up” (James, v. 14). Every priest knows how many are restored to health after receiving the last anointing, and many non-Catholic doctors and nurses marvel at the peace of soul and the calmness of mind which come to the patient after the visit of the priest. No one must expect a miracle after the conferring of Extreme Unction, but the relatives in every case should see that the priest is summoned and the anointing performed before unconsciousness ensues or the death agony begins.

DELAY IN ADMINISTERING THE SACRAMENT

Some Catholics, deceived by the widespread tradition or delusion that the reception of Extreme Unction is a prelude for death, defer sending for the priest until the patient loses consciousness. Evidently they forget the secondary effect of the Sacrament—to restore the sick person to bodily health. Primarily they must remember the spiritual graces conferred on the invalid through the prayers of the Church and the holy anointing at the hour of dissolution. When the illness is serious, send for the priest immediately, lest the patient lose consciousness or perhaps pass away without the consolations of religion. Even in cases of sudden death, summon the priest, since life is often retained even after apparent dissolution. During the same illness Extreme Unction may be administered only once, but, if the sick man rallies, he may be anointed as often as he relapses into the new danger of death. Never decide this in a family council: call in the priest and he will settle the difficulty according to the laws of the Church.

PHYSICAL EFFECTS

In the goodness and mercy of the Lord, the recovery of health may be another effect of this Sacrament. That more are not restored to vigor after the last anointing is not due to any defect in

the administration of the Sacrament, but rather to the weakness of faith of those who receive it. The Evangelist bears testimony to the incredulity of Christ's own people after beholding His wondrous miracles and hearing His heavenly doctrines. "Is this not the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary and his brothers, James and Joseph, and Simon and Jude? . . . But Jesus said to them: A prophet is not without honor save in his own country and in his own house. And he wrought not many miracles there because of their unbelief" (Matt., xiii. 55-58). The Christian religion has so increased and multiplied since Apostolic days that miraculous cures are not so necessary as in the beginning. Perhaps faith in the physical results of Extreme Unction is no longer so strong as in primeval days. Yet, in every serious illness the efficacy and necessity of this Sacrament must be impressed on the sick. Even though it does not raise up the sick man and restore him to vigor, it restores health to his soul, smooths the pillow of sorrow, and awakens in his heart the glorious assurance: "Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord" (Apoc., xiv. 13).

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Man's Inhumanity to Man

By J. M. LELEN

"The kingdom of Heaven is likened to a king who would take an account of his servants" (Matt., xviii. 23).

SYNOPSIS: *Introduction: General meaning of the parable.*

- I. A master deals most kindly with one of his servants.*
- II. This servant treats his own companion most cruelly.*
- III. The master severely punishes the unmerciful servant.*

God is the King figured in this parable—God who is the King of kings and the Supreme Ruler, God who made and who owns everything that exists in the universe, God who distributes according to His will the gifts of nature and the gifts of grace: "God who measures the waters in the hollow of His hand, and weighs the heavens with His palms; God who poises with three fingers the bulk of the earth." God is the King, and of this King we are the subjects. Sooner or later, here or hereafter, to this King we must give an account of our life. Blessed is he who—through the strokes

of sickness, through the prick and call of conscience, through the inspirations of the Holy Ghost—is summoned by God to give an account now when His justice is tempered with mercy, when the source of grace is still flowing, when the days of liberty are still ours, when the possibility of acquiring merit is still in our hands.

Such an advantage the servant mentioned in today's Gospel had, and had to the full. When the reckoning is made, it is found that this servant (call him the governor of a province or a satrap, if you prefer) owes ten thousand talents—ten million dollars, according to our money standard, an enormous sum then as now. How he had contracted such a debt is not to the point. History tells us that gambling, speculations, embezzlement—dangerous games to winners as well as to losers—are no new things under the sun.

IF WE COULD GRASP WHAT SIN IS!

The amount is great, and yet it is an imperfect image to express the immensity of man's transgression against God; it fails to represent adequately the debt of our sin. The servant's debt, after all, was finite; ours is infinite, since any mortal sin is an attack and an insult directed towards the Infinite. The ancient laws, which authorized the creditor to seize a man and his family and cast them into prison or hold them as slaves for debt, were nothing compared to the terrible sentence which some day will be pronounced over a sinner hardened and unrepentant. Here and now the warrant is already issued; there is one spot in hell reserved for him, but the execution is held back. God, like the king in the parable, makes us know in advance the frightful destiny which awaits us, precisely that we may avoid it; He threatens in order not to be compelled to punish.

What must then be our rule of conduct? Reread the fragment of the Gospel: The servant, knowing his dreadful doom, betakes himself to supplication, the one resource that remains to him; he falls down and beseeches the King, saying: "Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all." There is self-righteousness in these last words. The servant has never come to a true recognition of the immensity of his debt. He imagines that, if time is allowed, he can make all past shortcomings good. However, at the earnestness of his present prayer, the Lord of that servant being moved with com-

passion let him go, and forgave him entirely. We also must throw ourselves into the arms of divine mercy, humbly have recourse to prayer, and sincerely pledge ourselves to repentance and firm purpose of amendment.

That is not what the servant had in his mind, for scarcely was he gone out than he found one of his fellow-servants who owed him a comparatively trifling sum—about twenty dollars. Instantly, with never a thought of the generosity shown to himself, he grasps him brutally by the throat, demanding immediate payment. “Pay what thou owest,” he roars.

O hypocrite, dost not thou see that thou art about to irritate thy master and draw on thyself the thunderbolts of his indignation? He is good, he is kind, he is merciful, but so must be his servants; have a care lest he retracts his words of forgiveness. Nothing stops this human monster. It is in vain that the debtor, his own comrade and companion, uses exactly the same words of entreaty which he, in the agony of his distress, had used, and using had found mercy. He is deaf to this humble supplication; he drags his debtor with him to consign to the custody of the jailer.

SELF-EXAMINATION

Do we not sometimes act in the same manner? This servant, who owes very little, stands here for our neighbor, a neighbor who has offended us in some way—so we say, so we claim. And what is the cause of our coldness towards him? A word, a glance, a joke perhaps, which we have misunderstood. At any rate, the fact is this, that those whom we call our enemies owe us very little. Their wrongs are mainly in our fancy. And, even if real, they are nothing when compared to our wrongs towards God. Woe to us Catholics, if by our unforgiving spirit we grieve our brethren and scandalize those who do not share our Faith! Woe to us, for thereby we hurt the souls of our brethren and bring disgrace to God! “God is charity,” and, if there is no charity within us, we disprove Him, we mock Him, we dishonor Him, we give the lie to Him and His Church. Nay, we deny our membership in His Brotherhood, for the word of Christ is of perennial validity: “By this shall men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another.” Needless to add that we make ourselves unable to utter the clause of the

Lord's Prayer: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." We kill the condition of pardon. And that is what happened to the unmerciful servant.

The rest of the establishment, indignant at the sight of a conduct so cruel and so ungenerous, go in a body and lay the matter before the King; and he, summoning back the pardoned servant, gives sentence of condemnation in these sharp words of a just indignation: "Thou scoundrel! I discharged all thy debt to thee. Shouldst not thou have had mercy on thy fellow-servant?" And in righteous anger his master handed him over to the torturers. In the majesty of His Divinity Our Lord added these words for all ages: "So also shall My Heavenly Father do to you, if you forgive not every one his brother from your hearts."

SELF-PUNISHMENT

Stern is the sentence, and yet it is a self-imposed sentence. It will be our own sentence if we fail to forgive those who have offended us. For let us not forget it: God's pardon is not an effect of His sovereign pleasure; it is man's own state that fashions God's verdict. The Lord in the parable did not rescind his pardon: it is the servant who by his own unmerciful disposition made the remission of the debt impossible. God does not send souls to hell: they go there.

"Condemn not, and you shall not be condemned." "Forgive and you shall be forgiven." "Be ye merciful as your Father also is merciful." There is no precept that Christ has so often and so strongly inculcated as the necessity of reconciliation. Nor is there any commandment which men and women fail more frequently to observe.

Man, whose heaven-erected face
The smiles of love adorn—
Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn.

"I will get even! I will not lower myself!" they foolishly blurt out. Poor and proud people! They forget that every word they say may be their last. Woe to them if their last word is one of hatred!

Some time ago, in one of our railroad yards, an official without any cause insulted one of the workers. In a dignified manner the laborer uttered words of protest which were heard with applause by those who stood by. Thus humiliated, the "boss" flew into a fit of anger. "When I come back," he hissed, "I will see to it that you lose your job." And he boarded an incoming train to go to the next station. "You may never come back," some one replied. He came back—as a corpse. One more railroad fatality, and he was hurled into eternity. He was gone, still nursing his wrath. His power to injure his fellow-men was over. An accidental coincidence, you may say; yes, but God is the author of all contingencies.

CONCLUSION

One day St. Peter put the following query to Our Lord: "How often shall my brother offend against me, and I forgive him? Till seven times?" Such sevenfold forgiveness probably seemed to Peter an extreme stretch of kindness. But our Divine Lord, desiring to show how far removed man's calculations were from the boundless charity of God, answered: "I say not unto thee, till seven times; but till seventy times seven." There is no limit to the duty of forgiveness. "The quality of mercy is not strained." Again and again, and always, and everywhere we must forgive if we wish to be forgiven by the Eternal Judge.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Christ Our King

By JAMES MACLOUGHLIN, B.A., B.D.

"Pilate therefore said to Him: 'Art Thou a King then?' Jesus answered: 'Thou sayest that I am a King. For this was I born, and for this came I into the world'" (John, xviii. 37).

SYNOPSIS: I. *Christ is our King: (a) because as God He created us, (b) because He redeemed us from Satan.*

II. *Let us reflect on: (a) the person of Christ our King, His words, His voice, His touch, His actions, His personality; (b) the testimony of even rationalists about Christ; (c) how He Himself leads the way.*

III. Consider the object of His Kingdom: (a) war with our own enemy, Satan; (b) our attainment of Heaven if we are loyal.

Conclusion: For all these reasons we should not only be careful to follow Christ but to be enthusiastic in our following. A few suggestions how this may be done.

At different times in the course of the ecclesiastical year we consider Christ as the Babe of Bethlehem, as the Good Shepherd, as our Teacher (He is "the Way, the Truth and Light"), as our Redeemer, or perhaps as our Judge. Today, in a feast specially appointed for the purpose a few years ago, we do honor to Christ as our King.

He is our King by every right. As God, He has made us, and we are totally dependent on Him. He has redeemed us from sin at the price of His own Blood. St. Paul says: "You were bought with a great price" (I Cor., vi. 10). St. Peter (ii. 9) says: "You are a holy nation, a purchased people." In the Gospel passage I have just read for you we have Our Lord's own testimony that He is our King. And yet we read in the Gospel, if you remember, how Our Lord after the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, when He knew that the Jews in their enthusiasm "would come to take Him by force and make Him King, fled again into the mountains Himself alone" (John, vi. 15). Why was that? He gives us the answer in the Gospel for this feast: "My Kingdom is not of this world" (John, xviii. 36). In the world but not of it, His kingdom is not measured by human standards. It is only with the life of the soul that it is directly concerned.

Let us examine this Kingdom and Kingship a little more closely. Christ is the King. There never was a King like Christ. Examine His words recorded for us in the Gospels. They are simple. A child or an unlettered person can understand them. And yet the greatest minds have regarded them as unfathomable. Already nineteen centuries have been spent in examining His teaching, and it is not yet exhausted. The proclamations of an ordinary king have their interest for a time only; the words of Jesus are ever and always new.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST OUR KING

Think of the *voice* in which Jesus spoke these words—gentle, for-

giving: "Neither will I condemn thee," or "Father, forgive them." Hear His voice again rising in anger as in His fierce condemnation of the Pharisees for hypocrisy. Those who heard Him speak said: "Never did man speak as this man speaks." The disciples at Emmanuel said when Jesus had left them "was not our heart burning within us, whilst He spoke in the way" (Luke, xxiv. 32). The very *touch* of Jesus could heal. "And they brought unto Him also infants that He might touch them" (Luke, xviii. 15). Consider the *actions* of Jesus. "He went about doing good." St. Matthew says: "His life He spent for others." "No man hath done the deeds that I have done." See the *personality* of Christ our King—how the crowds followed Him up and down the highways of Palestine and even into the desert, not mindful even of where they might get food.

Even men who do not profess Christianity are forced to admire the character of Jesus. One, a German, Strauss, writes: "He is the highest object we can possibly imagine with respect to religion." That terrible cynic, Voltaire, had to confess that the grandeur of the life of Jesus inspired him with awe. The French naturalist, Renan, speaks of Jesus as the corner-stone of humanity, to take away which would be to shake the world to its foundations. An English rationalist, Lecky, says that in three short years Jesus did more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the philosophers and moralists.

OBJECTS OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM

How different, too, is Jesus from other kings in this: that He does not merely lay down His law and ask us to obey, but rather He Himself goes before and shows us how to follow. We shall have difficulties and trials. So had He, and our petty little trials are nothing compared with what His were. And He is constantly helping us, not only by His own example but by His personal and individual attention to each one of us.

With such a King then as the Head of our Kingdom, surely it should not be difficult for us to be loyal in our allegiance. We are engaged, Christ and we, in a war against that archenemy of mankind, Satan, "the prince of this world." And it is unlike other wars in this: that we *know* that, if we are loyal, our King will lead

us to victory. We know further that loyalty to Christ will make us happy even in this life—that His burden is light and His yoke sweet. And we have further assurance that, if we are faithful to Christ in this life, we have the promise of eternal life in the next.

ALLEGIANCE TO OUR KING

Why is it, then, that so many will desert Christ their King and follow the standard of Satan? It is because Satan has on his side the allurements of the world and everything that appeals to our lower nature. We must be watchful and follow close to the banner of Christ. And we should be more than mere followers. We should be enthusiastic in His service. See all the enthusiasms there are in the world in ever so many causes. See all the hero-worship there is in politics, in sport, in the various branches of art. See all that men are capable and willing to endure in the cause of science, or a discovery, or in looking for mere fame. Why cannot we take more of that capacity for loyalty and enthusiasm, and spiritualize it, and give to Christ?

How can we do it? We can think of Him more often, bring Him more into our daily lives. Pray to Him with earnestness and sincerity: "Thy Kingdom come!" Visit Him in the Blessed Sacrament. Let our genuflections before Him be acts of homage. And however disloyal we may be at times, there is one resolution that all can make, and that is: whatever else may happen, never to be guilty of the terrible treachery of deserting Him altogether—and that is what happens if one commits a mortal sin.

Book Reviews

THE ANGELIC DOCTOR

The brief but withal broadly comprehensive title of Maritain's volume¹ permits a wider scope for his present admirable essay than does the apparently descriptive sub-title—"The Life and Thought of Saint Thomas Aquinas." For the "Life" should ordinarily indicate a biography, pure and simple, whereas it really occupies only one-seventh of the book (46 pages) and within that slight compass comments with fair elaborateness on the comparatively few details it includes. And the "Thought" is not merely a philosophical inquiry, but is rather a demonstration of the uniquely practical character—the "actuality" for all time—of the Saint's thought for the solution of all the intricate problems of life. One may hereupon recall Ben Jonson's view that the myriad-minded Shakespeare was "not of an age, but for all time." If the author's wide and deep thesis might be suggested briefly in his own words, these two sentences might serve: "Thomism is a form of wisdom. Between it and the particular forms of culture incessant vital exchanges must be made, but it is rigorously independent in its essence of those particular forms." It is therefore not of an age—even of the thirteenth, the greatest of centuries—but for all time. It furnishes universal principles; but the ever-varying applications of the principles are particularizations in the tides of time. It is therefore immensely "practical," as may be illustrated in one paragraph: "As Thomas Aquinas united in his marvellously tempered constitution the talents of the men of the North and South, of Norman and Lombard; as he integrated in his doctor's mission the Italy of the Popes, the Germany of Albert the Great, the France of St. Louis and the University of Paris; as he combined the treasures of the Greeks and the Latins, the Arabs and the Jews, with the inheritance bequeathed by the Fathers and Christian wisdom, in a word the entire contribution of the known world of his time, so his marvellously synthetic and organic theology, open to every aspect of reality, offers the intellectual tendencies peculiar to the various nations, and more particularly *to the three just mentioned*, the means of exercising themselves freely, not in mutual destruction, but in mutual completion and consolidation" (pages 82, 83). I have ventured to confer italics on five words in order to emphasize the "practicality" and the "actuality" of the Saint's "Thought" in concrete instances of peculiarly present-day importance to the peace of the whole world.

¹ *The Angelic Doctor: The Life and Thought of Saint Thomas Aquinas.* By Jacques Maritain. Translated by J. F. Scanlan (New York. Lincoln MacVeagh, The Dial Press. 1931. 300 pages).

The very brief sketch of the Saint's "Life" is followed by three Chapters with significant titles. *The Wise Architect* (who may have builded better than even he knew) "is our predestined guide in the reconstruction of Christian culture, the steward and minister of that great blessed kingdom which the Church, in the admirable Preface to the Mass of Christ the King, describes as the kingdom of truth and life, of sanctity and grace, of justice, love and peace" (page 107). *The Apostle of Our Time* will enable us, if only we love the Truth as he loved it, thirst for it like him, and "are ready to sacrifice everything to slake that thirst, . . . really to understand—*intellectu conspicere*—the things he taught, and to be of use to the best of our ability, poor though it be, in that universal task of restoration in truth entrusted to him by the Master of History" (page 148). The Chapter entitled *The Common Doctor* "is merely an attempt to define the attitude adopted by the Catholic Church in regard to the philosophy of St. Thomas, leaving theology, which maintains an intrinsic and essential relation with faith, out of consideration." These three chapters are followed by three Appendices (covering about one-third of the volume): (1) Chronological Tables of the Saint's authentic works ("taken from a series of synopses drawn up by M. René Labergerie and shortly to be published in book form"), giving the dates of their appearance ("which are partly provisional because scholars will disagree on many points and many important works are in course of publication"); (2) Testimonies of the Supreme Pontiffs; (3) the Encyclical *Æterni Patris* of Leo XIII, the *Motu Proprio Doctoris Angelici* of Pius X, and the Encyclical *Studiorum Ducem* of Pius XI.

The reviewer needs to commend neither the knowledge nor the most attractive style of Jacques Maritain, already so well appreciated through his previous writings. But a word of acknowledgment is due both to his felicitous translator (who has enriched the volume by occasional happy footnotes of his own) and to the publishers (who have given to Maritain's essay of three hundred pages an attractive letterpress, wide margins, and stout binding). In contents and in form we have an admirable book, whose purpose is expressed in the Prayer of the Saint's Feast prefacing the essay and in the Saint's own Prayer which forms, as it were, an exquisitely appropriate colophon.

H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

MARIOLOGY OF ST. JOHN DAMASCENE

A new work on Mariology is especially timely this year, when the Church is celebrating the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Ephesus and honoring the dogma of the divine maternity of Mary there defined. Wherefore, we are doubly glad to welcome Fr. Mitchel's recently pub-

lished volume on the Mariological teachings of St. John Damascene.¹ The author is a confrère of Fr. Friedel, who some years ago produced, also at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, an able study of the Marian writings of Cardinal Newman.

The central doctrine of Mariology is, of course, that which was declared at Ephesus in 431, namely, that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God. It is interesting to note in the volume before us how clearly, strongly and eloquently this doctrine is proclaimed and explained by the great Doctor of Damascus. The sublime dignity of Mary's Motherhood is declared by him to be that which is most vital in the teaching about her; it is constantly appealed to as the explanation of her singular prerogatives and power and of her right to special honor; indeed, he states that it is the very reason for her existence, as she was brought into the world for the express purpose of acting on our behalf.

The earthly life of Mary and the privileges that grow out of her unique position are also dealt with by the Damascene, and Fr. Mitchel has thus been enabled to construct an orderly and well-rounded treatise on Mariology from the data scattered here and there in St. John's theological writings and sermons. Two especially interesting chapters are those on the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption. St. John of Damascus is noted for his acquaintance with the teachings of his predecessors, and his monumental work, "The Source of Knowledge," is their systematic summary. This renders his testimony to the Immaculate Conception most weighty. Fr. Mitchel has quoted many beautiful passages in which the Saint pictures, now in one way and now in another, Mary's initial sanctity—her exemption from all that is contained in the notion of original sin, her marvellous holiness at the first moment of her conception, her superiority to angels as well as men, her stainlessness of soul as well as of body, her freedom from the disorders and penalties introduced by sin. The importance of St. John's teaching on the Assumption of Mary is seen at once from the fact that he has been entitled the "Doctor of the Assumption." Three homilies that he delivered in his old age on the Feast of the *Dormitio* of the Blessed Virgin are a proof that belief in her bodily entrance into beatitude was expressed by a special holyday in the eighth century. He is regarded as the principal exponent of the historical argument for belief in the Assumption, and, while he speaks with the utmost caution about details and circumstances in the narrative of Mary's death, burial and taking up, he does refer for her bodily glorification to an oral tradition passed down from father to son from former days. His theological reasons in favor of the mystery (such as Mary's divine maternity, her

¹The *Mariology of St. John Damascene*, by Valentine Albert Mitchel, S.M. S.T.D. (Maryhurst Normal Press, Kirkwood, Mo.).

sinlessness and virginity) are developed by him with a persuasiveness and eloquence worthy of a great Father and Doctor of the Church.

Preachers will find this book of great interest, since John Damascene ranks among the greatest sacred orators the Church has known. The elegance of his style earned for him among the Greeks the surname "stream of gold," and this together with the rich content of his sermons makes it a matter of great regret that a large part of his homilies have perished. Some of his most notable orations were delivered on feasts of the Blessed Virgin, and the quotations from them in the present work give some idea of the qualities that made him so remarkable a minister of the word. Students of theology likewise will enjoy this volume—the only one in English, in so far as we know, that deals specially with the writings of the Damascene. For St. John constructed what may be described as the *Summa Theologica* of the Greek Fathers, an achievement that has won him renown in the Orient as its greatest theologian, and that largely influenced the development of Western Scholasticism. Finally, Fr. Mitchel's work is a devotional book. The Damascene speaks in the accent of unaffected piety, and his Mariology shows him as one of the foremost advocates of Marian devotion and a model in its solid and fruitful exercise. J. A. McHUGH, O.P.

OUR LORD'S PARABLES

The first volume of Fr. Vosté's work on the Parables of the Gospels, which was reviewed some months ago in THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW, treated of the dogmatic parables on the kingdom of God and its members. The present volume passes from the earthly period of Christ's kingdom—its promulgation, establishment and progress—to its heavenly period that sets in with the glorious coming of Christ and the Last Judgment.¹ The eschatological parables are of the utmost importance, since they treat not merely of the last days of individuals, which come with death, but of the passing away of the present world and of the fate of all members of the race. But these parables of the last things also present one of the greatest difficulties found in the New Testament. As Fr. Vosté remarks in his Introduction, the eschatological problem is as much a crux to the New Testament exegete as the Mosaic question is to the Old Testament scholar. Modernism teaches that either Our Lord or the Evangelists were in error about the nearness of the Parousia, and thus it casts discredit on the authority of Christ and the Gospels and weakens faith in the future life. In fact, the Modernistic position on the eschatology of the New Testament cannot be admitted without a denial of the divinity of Christ

¹*Parabolæ Selectæ Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*, by J. M. Vosté, O.P., S.Scr.D. (Collegio Angelico, Rome).

or of the truthfulness of the Bible. Though Our Lord did know the day and the hour of the end of all things, He was not commissioned to reveal them, and in this sense, as the envoy of the Father, He could truly be said to know them not (Mark, xiii. 32). But it was just as impossible for Him to be ignorant of the future as it was for the Holy Spirit to move the sacred writers to put down error. Our Lord wished His disciples to watch and pray in preparation for His coming, and therefore He purposely refused to instruct them about its time, leaving them in ignorance on this point for their own benefit (Matt., xxv. 13).

Fr. Vosté points out that the chief cause of the eschatological difficulty is the apparently close connection between the destruction of the Temple and the end of the world as announced in the discourses on the second coming made just before the passion. But the difficulty is cleared up by a careful reading of the texts, from which it appears that the disciples had questioned Our Lord confusedly about two events, the end of the Temple and the signs of the second coming. Therefore, Our Lord spoke of the two together. The former was near at hand ("This generation shall not pass till all things be accomplished"), just as summer is nigh when the fig begins to put forth its leaves; but the latter was a mystery of God which no messenger from God, even though he be an angel, or the Son of God Himself, had any knowledge of as far as His message was concerned ("That day or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father"). The former was to be a figure and proof of the latter, but the time of the latter was to remain uncertain for the sake of vigilance. The lesson of the great eschatological discourse therefore was watchfulness:

In order that dying he might come to life
He lived as one who was to die.

(Inscription on the tomb of Cardinal Aussia
in the Basilica of Sta. Sabina, Rome).

There are seven parables explained by Fr. Vosté in connection with this Synoptic Apocalypse, viz., those of the leafing fig-tree, of the man going abroad and leaving servants in charge, of the thief who comes by night, of the procurators appointed to distribute to their fellow-servants, of the wise and foolish virgins, of the talents and of the mass. After the conclusion of the eschatological parables the author adds a study of the description of the Last Judgment given in Matt., xxv. 31-46.

As the title announces, this second volume treats, along with the eschatological, also the moral parables. In these latter lessons of Christ we are taught the chief duties owed by man to God and his neighbor, the right use of possessions, the manner in which mankind and especially the Apostles should walk in the footsteps of Christ. Thus, in respect to the service of God, there are seven parables that illustrate the

duties of labor, prayer, repentance, humility. Seven others inculcate charity, forgiveness, mercy, modesty to one's fellowman. The important subject of the right employment of earthly goods is explained in the four parables of the man who was looking forward to a long enjoyment of his wealth, of the man who built a tower, of the dishonest steward, of the rich glutton. The moral of these narratives was the tragic mistake of storing up for this world and not for the world to come, the grandeur of renunciation for Christ's sake, the eternal fruits derived from temporalities used in alms or other good works, the wickedness of those who devote to luxury what should be given the poor.

This excellent work bestows more than it promises, for in addition to the parables it discusses some of the more weighty moral rules spoken by Our Lord in metaphorical form, and also two notable allegories of the Fourth Gospel, namely, those on the Good Shepherd and on the Vine and the Branches. Of the concise moral rules here treated some were for the faithful in general, such as the passages on the broad and narrow ways: on the houses built, one on the rock, the other on the sand; on taking the yoke and cross of Christ: while others were specially directed to the Apostles, as that they should be the salt of the earth, the light of the world, etc.

The method followed by Father Vosté in his explanation of these great Gospel passages is distinguished by thoroughness, clearness and spirituality. Each subject is discussed under the heads of text, context, literal meaning, moral application, and history of interpretation. Each verse and word of importance is elucidated, while difficulties are not passed over. But there is nothing dry or merely academic in the author's treatment, and his practical reflections and applications make his book very suitable for use in meditations and in sermons on Gospel themes. For twenty years Fr. Vosté has been lecturing five times a week on the Scriptures. The present work and eleven others on Biblical subjects show how fruitfully and successfully he has labored.

C. J. CALLAN, O.P.

SANITY IN MATTERS OF SEX

Sex plays an important part in human life. Happiness largely depends upon the right attitude towards this basic fact of life. Thousands of lives have been wrecked by a wrong orientation in the sex sphere. The proper management of the sex life, therefore, constitutes a vital problem.

To think that the sex life will automatically right itself, and that it requires no special attention, is a notion that has been thoroughly discredited by experience. Deliberate control in the realm of sex is indispensable to right human living. Reticence and reserve in matters

pertaining to sex are laudable, but to ignore the problem of sex entirely is a disastrous and extremely costly policy which at the present has very few advocates. It is now well admitted that there must be systematic sex education and methodical training in purity. An apology for the publication of books that take up this problem is no longer necessary.

To gain the right attitude towards the problem of sex a real understanding of the meaning of sex is the first requisite. Professor Dietrich von Hildebrand deals with this subject.¹ He shows that only Catholic philosophy keeps itself free from exaggeration in the treatment of the problem, and assigns to sex its right and proper place in life. Chastity appears not merely as a negative virtue that only represses, but as a constructive virtue which organizes life into a consistent and harmonious whole. The book is rich in beautiful and inspiring passages, and will be welcome to all who deplore modern sex laxity and wish to save mankind from the misery and degradation it has caused.

Speculative interpretation of the significance of sex in human life is something that will appeal to a rather limited clientèle. The majority look for something of a more practical nature. Dr. James J. Walsh offers us a book of this type.² Though the volume is entitled, "Sex Instruction," it really deals with all the practical phases of the problem. Its comprehensiveness makes it a source of much valuable information and a very useful guide for educators and social workers. The author brings to his task the experience of a physician, which is particularly desirable in a subject-matter having numerous contacts with medical science. The modern theories concerning the relation between sex repression and psychoneuroses are carefully examined and corrected in the light of Scholastic psychology. Though the author deems sex instruction necessary, he stresses will training and character education. This, of course, is in harmony with the best traditions and represents fully the Catholic point of view. It is especially important to impart the required information at the right moment so that it may do a maximum of good and not come after irreparable damage has been done. As to this question of When and How the pages of the book contain abundant material. The author's suggestions may safely be followed.

The main thesis of the volume is the contention that sex in our age is overstimulated, and that this condition of affairs is exceedingly harmful to the growing generation. Our efforts must be directed towards eliminating sex incitement as much as this is possible. Until the public awakens to a realization of the seriousness of this evil and puts a stop to it, individual parents and educators will have to safeguard their charges against the corrupting influence of an environment in which

¹ *In Defense of Purity. An Analysis of the Catholic Ideals of Purity and Virginity*, by Dietrich von Hildebrand (Longmans, Green & Co., New York City).

² *Sex Instruction*, by James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D. (Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York City).

sex looms so disproportionately large. In this connection the protective value of the sense of shame is strongly emphasized. By their imprudent attacks on modesty the moderns have almost completely destroyed the sense of shame. In many it must be almost entirely rebuilt; in all it should be deliberately cultivated as one of the most powerful bulwarks of purity. Those who know Dr. Walsh need not be told that whatever he says he says exceedingly well.

Smaller in compass but rich in content is a little volume from the pen of Father Pire. The author addresses himself to young boys and adolescents, and speaks to them in a fatherly and impressive manner on the beauty of the virtue of purity and the ugliness of the contrary vice.³ The youthful reader will derive much inspiration and profit from these pages written with great earnestness, understanding and sympathy.

CHARLES BRUEHL, D.D.

³ *The Heart of a Young Man, or Talks on Personal Purity to Boys*, by the Rev. Lionel E. Pire, C.P.P.S. (Frederick Pustet Co., Inc., New York City).

SOME RECENT MORAL WORKS

The thirty-third edition of Sabetti's Moral Theology, the seventh that has appeared since the Code of Canon Law, was finished recently by Fr. Timothy Barrett, S.J., and is now in use. There are a number of additions to the previous edition, which came out two years ago. In the Addenda are fourteen new pages, which contain quotations from recent important Roman pronouncements, decrees, decisions, and also paragraphs on the interpretation of Canon 81 and on the cases in which an act naturally illicit is also invalid.

"Handbook of Notes on Theology," by Andrew F. Browne, C.S.S.R. (Press of Blackwell Wielandy Co., St. Louis) is a "handy notebook of ready reference containing such matters as are deemed of practical importance, as well as such principles as will have a direct bearing on the solution of many difficult cases" in Moral Theology. The booklet has 98 pages, is nearly all in English, and will be very useful for quick reference by the busy priest in settling the theological problems that oftenest occur in the ministry.

Two new books on sex morality are "The Difficult Commandment," by C. C. Martindale, S.J., and "Into Their Company. A Book for a Modern Girl on Love and Marriage," by a Medical Woman, a Girl and a Wife. With an introduction by Father Martindale, S.J. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York).

Father Martindale was asked to write a book on self-control for girls, but decided that this was not a matter for a man, at least not for a priest. Conversation is the best method of approach to this subject, and a familiar talk on such intimate matters comes more naturally

from a woman, especially as she is better acquainted with the psychology and problems of the young girl. The three ladies who wrote "Into Their Company" have modelled their book on Fr. Martindale's "The Difficult Commandment," having in view especially the difficulties of modern girls and the vocation of most women to motherhood. The ideal for the woman of today as for the woman of the past is admittance into the company of holy virgins or holy matrons who were the glory of their sex in past times. The Church and society alike look to modern women to be faithful to the work of their predecessors as guardians of purity and makers of the home. Fidelity to the maxims of this little book is far more important for women than taking part in public affairs, social, political, educational and the like.

J. A. McHUGH, O.P.

The HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXI

NUMBERS 7-12

APRIL, 1931, TO SEPTEMBER, 1931

PASTORALIA

By Charles Bruehl, D.D.

PAGE

<i>Popular Apologetics</i>	685
<i>Some Practical Points on Apologetics</i>	797
<i>Pastoral Theology</i>	909
<i>The Pastoral Ministry</i>	1021
<i>Modern Need of the Spiritual Ministry</i>	1133
<i>The Spirit of the Seminary</i>	1245

HOMILETICAL SERIES

By the Right Rev. Msgr. H. T. Henry, Litt.D.

<i>New Haven: Then and Now</i>	693
<i>Argue Not, but Preach</i>	806
<i>The Scolding Preacher</i>	917
<i>Personalities in Preaching</i>	1029
<i>Mimicry in Preaching</i>	1142
<i>Preaching on Impurity</i>	1253

PRACTICAL ASCETICAL NOTES FOR PRIESTS

By C. C. Martindale, S.J., M.A.

<i>Non Multi Sapientes: Scientia Inflat</i>	710
<i>Facilius Camelum</i>	820
<i>Non Habet Ubi Ponat Caput</i>	930
<i>Hearing Them and Asking Them Questions</i>	1043
<i>A Sense of Humor</i>	1162
<i>In Omnem Veritatem</i>	1266

PROCEDURAL LAW OF THE CODE

By Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., LL.B.

<i>Lawsuits</i>	731
<i>Rescissory Actions and Restitutio in Integrum</i>	839

	PAGE
<i>Possessory Actions or Remedies</i>	957
<i>Extinguishment of Right of Action</i>	1069
<i>Introduction of the Trial in Civil Cases</i>	1181
<i>Formal Opening of the Trial</i>	1279

GOD AND EVOLUTION

By John A. O'Brien, Ph.D.

<i>Evolution: an Ally of Religion</i>	923
<i>An Interpretation of the Implications of Evolution</i>	1035
<i>An Inquiry into Natural Selection</i>	1148

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

By Paul E. Campbell, A.M., Litt.D., LL.D.

<i>The Beginnings of Supervision</i>	720
<i>The Teaching of History</i>	831
<i>School Records and Reports</i>	942
<i>Who May Teach the Child?</i>	1054
<i>Education and Educators</i>	1166
<i>Educators and Education. II</i>	1295

LITURGICAL NOTES

By the Benedictine Monks of Buckfast Abbey

<i>St. Mark's Procession</i>	741
<i>The Month of May as the Month of Mary</i>	853
<i>The Feast of the Most Holy Trinity</i>	966
<i>St. James the Apostle, July 25</i>	1077
<i>The Nativity of Our Blessed Lady</i>	1192
<i>Christus Rex</i>	1302

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS ON THE SODALITY

By John K. Sharp

<i>The Sodality Club Room</i>	727
<i>Personal Holiness and the Sodality</i>	847
<i>Catholic Action and the Sodality</i>	950

CASUS MORALES

<i>Marriage before a Non-Catholic Minister.</i> By William V. Greene, C.S.S.R., J.C.D.	752
<i>Doubtfully Consecrated Hosts.</i> By H. Davis, S.J.	871
<i>Material Cooperator Held to Restitution.</i> By Leo P. Foley, C.M., D.D... ..	980
<i>Civil Divorce.</i> By H. Davis, S.J.	1101
<i>A Marriage That Was Void.</i> By A. Vermeersch, S.J.	1211
<i>The Obligation of the Marriage Debt.</i> By Leo P. Foley, C.M., D.D.....	1319

MISCELLANEOUS CONTRIBUTIONS

<i>The Ethics of Birth Control.</i> By Dominic Pruemmer, O.P., S.T.D. II. <i>The Effects of Neo-Malthusianism</i>	701
<i>Stained Glass.</i> By Ralph Adams Cram	714
<i>Keeping Back the Color Line.</i> By Joseph P. Donovan, C.M., J.C.D.....	812
<i>The Blessed Sacrament As It Appeals to a Convert Protestant Minister.</i> By A. Longfellow Fiske	824

	PAGE
<i>Gleanings From the Scriptural Field.</i> By Ernest Graf, O.S.B.	859
Εὐχαριστία — Εὐχαριτία	859
<i>The Book of Tobias and the Achicar Legend</i>	860
<i>Was St. Paul the Rich Young Man of Matthew, xix. 16, etc.</i>	863
<i>Why Gallopers?</i> By George Zimpfer	934
<i>The Book of Proverbs.</i> By Hugh Cogan, D.D.	1047
<i>Catholic Broadcasting in Britain.</i> By J. I. Lane	1062
<i>A Neglected Part of "Casti Connubii."</i> By Franklyn J. Kennedy	1084
<i>Our Reading Problem.</i> By the Rev. Father Walter, O.S.B.	1088
<i>The Church in Germany.</i> By George N. Shuster	1155
<i>The Book of Proverbs.</i> By Hugh Cogan, D.D.,	
II. <i>Character Sketches from Proverbs</i>	1174
<i>The Hospital Chaplain.</i> By William Schaefer	1199
<i>Problems of the Church in Germany.</i> By George N. Shuster	1259
<i>Is There a Volstead Cow?</i> By J. Elliot Ross, Ph.D.	1270
<i>In Memoria Lacrymar.</i> By A. J. Carmody	1289

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

By Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., LL.B.

<i>Christmas Midnight Mass</i>	746
<i>Obligation of the Mass for the People in Poor Parishes</i>	747
<i>The Tabernacle Veil</i>	748
<i>Last Blessing in Articulo Mortis Received in a State of Sin</i>	749
<i>Ecclesiastical Burial for Notorious Criminals</i>	750
<i>Is the Pastor or Parish the Owner and Administrator of Funds of Church Societies?</i>	864
<i>Some Difficulty about Avoiding Violation of Seal of Confession in Hearing Patients in Hospitals</i>	865
<i>Mistake in Judgment Discovered After Confession</i>	865
<i>May Past Good Works Suffice for Sacramental Confession?</i>	867
<i>Extent of Authority of the State Over the Life of Criminals</i>	868
<i>Declarations of Dogma before the Declaration of Infallibility</i>	868
<i>Reservation by Local Ordinaries of Sins Punished With a Censure in Canon Law</i>	869
<i>Civil Law Impediment of Age in Reference to Validity of Marriage in Canon Law</i>	973
<i>Some Rubrics Concerning Holy Communion and Vesting of Priest for Mass</i>	975
<i>Validation of a Certain Marriage</i>	976
<i>Concerning Absolution of Masons</i>	977
<i>Vicar-General and Chancellor in Missionary Countries</i>	978
<i>Implied Dispensation from Impediment of Crime</i>	1095
<i>Dispensation by Telephone or Telegram</i>	1095
<i>Signing of Promises in Mixed Marriages</i>	1095
<i>Sanatio of Marriage of Two Catholics</i>	1095
<i>Pre-Matrimonial Agreement on Use of Contraceptives</i>	1097
<i>Concerning Gregorian Masses</i>	1098
<i>Modesty in Dress</i>	1099
<i>The "Sanatio in Radice": Its Use and Abuse</i>	1204
<i>Priests' Retreat Without Mass</i>	1206
<i>Protestant Minister Giving Invocation or Benediction in Presence of Catholic Priest</i>	1207

<i>Early First Communion and Difficulty of Getting the Children for Further Instruction</i>	1208
<i>Poverty of a Parish as an Excuse for Using Other than Beeswax Candles</i>	1209
<i>May Diocesan Courts Follow Opinions of Theologians?</i>	1209
<i>Mixture of Cotton Seed Oil and Olive Oil in the Administration of the Sacraments</i>	1310
<i>Manner of Action of Ecclesiastical Corporations</i>	1310
<i>Benediction With the Ostensorium in Convent Chapels</i>	1311
<i>Relation of Subjects to Ecclesiastical Superiors</i>	1312
<i>Concerning the Indulgence for Saying the Rosary in the Presence of the Blessed Sacrament</i>	1314
<i>Delegation for Assistance at Marriage</i>	1315

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

<i>New Pontifical Dutch College at Rome</i>	760
<i>Fifteenth Centenary of the Council of Ephesus</i>	760
<i>Additions to the Index</i>	760
<i>Title of "His Most Reverend Excellency"</i>	761
<i>Indulgenced Invocation to the "Queen of Apostles"</i>	761
<i>Plenary Indulgence for Recitation of the Divine Office before the Blessed Sacrament Is Extended to Nuns</i>	761
<i>Official Interpretations of the Code (Canon 349, § 2, n. 2; Canon 1116)....</i>	761
<i>New Papal Seal</i>	762
<i>Relimitation of the Ecclesiastical Provinces and Dioceses of Prussia.....</i>	762
<i>Creation of New Vicariates and Prefectures Apostolic</i>	762
<i>Introduction of the Cause of John Baptist of St. Michael the Archangel..</i>	763
<i>Pontifical Appointments</i>	763
<i>New Circumscription of Ecclesiastical Provinces and Dioceses in Prussia..</i>	876
<i>Official Report of the Radio Address of the Supreme Pontiff</i>	876
<i>Seventh Centenary of the Death of St. Anthony of Padua</i>	876
<i>Rosary Indulgences Extended to the Byzantine-Slavic Rite</i>	877
<i>Official Declarations on the Code (Canons 323, 419, § 1, 423)</i>	877
<i>Pontifical Appointments</i>	877
<i>Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments</i>	982
<i>Books Placed on the Index</i>	993
<i>Decree on Sexual Education and Eugenics</i>	993
<i>Decree on the Use of Blessed Bells</i>	994
<i>Pontifical Appointments</i>	994
<i>Some Points from the Recent Encyclical on Labor</i>	1105
<i>The Holy Father Defends the Catholic Action in Italy</i>	1107
<i>American Society for Foreign Missions Receives Charge of Wuchow Mission</i>	1108
<i>Society of the Catholic Union</i>	1108
<i>Indulgences of the Way of the Cross for the Sick</i>	1108
<i>Pontifical Appointments</i>	1109
<i>Encyclical on the Restoration of the Social Order and the Perfecting of the Same According to the Law of the Gospel</i>	1213
<i>Sermon of His Holiness Protesting Against the Outrages Done to the Catholic Action</i>	1213
<i>Book by Alberto Del Fante Condemned</i>	1213
<i>Rights and Duties of the Vicar-General and Vicar-Capitular</i>	1214
<i>Pontifical Appointments</i>	1215
<i>Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities</i>	1322
<i>Regulations by the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities on the Apostolic Constitution on Catholic Universities</i>	1324

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUR READERS

PAGE

"Gallopers" and "Sprinters." By the Right Rev. John L. Belford, D.D....	757
A Question That Is Never Answered. By M. V. Kelly, C.S.B.	874
Hospital Chaplains. By George T. Schmidt	1317

SERMONS FOR SUNDAYS AND FEASTS

Fourth Sunday after Easter. <i>The Pledge of the Spirit.</i> By S. Anselm Parker, O.S.B., M.A.	764
Fifth Sunday after Easter. <i>The Social Value of Prayer.</i> By D. J. Macdonald, Ph.D.	769
Sunday Within the Octave of the Ascension. <i>Kindness or Charity.</i> By H. B. Loughnan, S.J.	773
Pentecost Sunday. <i>The Effects of the Holy Ghost's Coming.</i> By Thomas B. Chetwood, S.J.	778
Trinity Sunday. <i>Our Share in the Life of the Blessed Trinity.</i> By Lambert Nolle, O.S.B.	782
Second Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Frequent Communion.</i> By J. Elliot Ross, Ph.D.	878
Third Sunday after Pentecost. <i>The Sinner and Divine Mercy.</i> By Ferdinand Heckmann, O.F.M.	882
Fourth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>The Word of God.</i> By P. M. Northcote	888
Fifth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Charity.</i> By Francis Blackwell, O.S.B., M.A.	893
Sixth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>The Multiplication of the Loaves.</i> By the Right Rev. Msgr. Victor Day, V.G.	995
Seventh Sunday after Pentecost. <i>False Prophets.</i> By Bonaventure McIntyre, O.F.M.	998
Eighth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>The Right Use of Riches.</i> By Bede Hess, O.M.C.	1002
Ninth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Contentment With God's Providence.</i> By Albert Wood, D.D.	1007
Tenth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>The Art of Praying.</i> By Charles C. Miltner, C.S.C.	1110
Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost. <i>The Ceremonies of Baptism</i> By Lambert Nolle, O.S.B.	1114
Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Who Is My Neighbor?</i> By A. E. Mul-lany, O.S.B.	1117
Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Ignoring God.</i> By Hugh F. Blunt, LL.D.	1120
Fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>One Is Your Master, Christ.</i> By Gerald J. Finan, A.M., S.T.B.	1124
Fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Human Life.</i> By D. J. Macdonald, Ph.D.	1216
Sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>The Third Commandment.</i> By R. J. Meaney, O.P.	1220
Seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Catholic Unity.</i> By H. B. Loughnan, S.J.	1225
Eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Perseverance.</i> By James S. Lineen, B.A.	1231
Nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost. <i>The Wedding Garment.</i> By Lambert Nolle, O.S.B.	1325
Twentieth Sunday After Pentecost. <i>Extreme Unction.</i> By Thomas P. Phelan, LL.D.	1329
Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Man's Inhumanity to Man.</i> By J. M. Lelen	1334
Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost. <i>Christ Our King.</i> By James Mac-Loughlin, B.A., B.D.	1338

BOOK REVIEWS

PAGE

<i>The Sacrifice of the Mass.</i> By J. A. McHugh, O.P.	787
<i>Preachers and Sermons.</i> By H. T. Henry, Litt.D.	788
<i>Adolescence and Age.</i> By Charles Bruehl, D.D.	790
<i>A Convert's Testimony.</i> By Thomas P. Phelan, LL.D.	791
<i>Towards Better Understanding.</i> By Charles Bruehl, D.D.	782
<i>Elizabeth and the Perversion of England.</i> By Thomas P. Phelan, LL.D.	793
<i>Devotion to the Sacred Heart.</i> By John K. Sharp	795
<i>A Catholic Dictionary</i>	796
<i>Some New Works on the Bible.</i> By C. J. Callan, O.P.	898
<i>Aids to the Study of Scholastic Philosophy.</i> By Charles Bruehl, D.D.	900
<i>The Book of Ruth.</i> By John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L.	901
<i>The Remedy for Economic Ills.</i> By Charles Bruehl, D.D.	902
<i>For the Pamphlet Rack.</i> By John K. Sharp	904
<i>An Armful of Books</i>	906
<i>Christ Our Brother.</i> By John L. Belford, D.D.	1012
<i>Catholic Doctrine and Defense.</i> By Charles Bruehl, D.D.	1013
<i>Roads to Rome.</i> By H. T. Henry, Litt.D.	1015
<i>For the Pamphlet Rack.</i> By John K. Sharp	1016
<i>A Broken Career.</i> By Thomas P. Phelan, LL.D.	1018
<i>An Armful of Books</i>	1020
<i>The Origin of Religion.</i> By Albert Muntzsch, S.J.	1129
<i>Modern Education.</i> By George N. Shuster	1130
<i>Psychology and Theodicy.</i> By Charles Bruehl, D.D.	1131
<i>Homiletics.</i> By H. T. Henry, Litt.D.	1236
<i>"Treasury of the Faith."</i> By J. A. McHugh, O.P.	1238
<i>Liturgy of the Mass.</i> By Paul E. Campbell, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.	1240
<i>Christian Literature.</i> By Charles Bruehl, D.D.	1241
<i>An Armful of Books</i>	1242
<i>The Angelic Doctor.</i> By H. T. Henry, Litt.D.	1342
<i>Mariology of St. John Damascene.</i> By J. A. McHugh, O.P.	1343
<i>Our Lord's Parables.</i> By C. J. Callan, O.P.	1345
<i>Sanity in Matters of Sex.</i> By Charles Bruehl, D.D.	1347
<i>Some Recent Moral Works.</i> By J. A. McHugh, O.P.	1349

